



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A N
E N Q U I R Y
W H E N T H E
R E S U R R E C T I O N O F T H E " B O D Y " O R " F L E S H " W A S
F I R S T I N S E R T E D I N T O
T H E P U B L I C C R E E D S.

HO. d.
333.



600092036Q



/



AN
ENQUIRY
WHEN THE
RESURRECTION OF THE "BODY," OR "FLESH," WAS
FIRST INSERTED INTO
THE PUBLIC CREEDS.

AN
ENQUIRY
WHEN THE
RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, OR FLESH, WAS
FIRST INSERTED INTO
THE PUBLIC CREEDS.

BY THE LATE
ARTHUR ASHLEY SYKES, D.D.,
Prebendary of Winchester, etc.

PUBLISHED FROM THE AUTHOR'S MANUSCRIPT, BY HIS BROTHER
G. SYKES, A.M.,
A.D. 1757.

NOW CAREFULLY REPRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR.

LONDON:
W. WHITE, 36 BLOOMSBURY STREET,
OXFORD STREET.
1857.

No. d. 333.

LONDON :
MITCHELL AND SON, PRINTERS,
WARDOUR STREET (W).

THE PREFACE.

It may be justly questioned, whether there was any particular set form of a Creed made or left by the apostles, upon profession of which persons were admitted to baptism. What is commonly called, *the Apostle's Creed*, plainly was not made by them. They seem to have instructed the *Gentiles* in the belief of the *one God*, the Maker of all things, and in the duty they were to pay Him as the Father of all; and then they proceeded to acquaint them, *how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power.—That He was Lord of all—and that He was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead. Acts x. 34—42.* This was what the apostles taught the *Gentiles*, and pressed upon them by various arguments, *preaching peace by Jesus Christ unto them.*

A faith in God was already openly professed by the *Jews*; and therefore there was no need of a particular instruction of them in that article. But then they were to be put in mind of what they

knew ; and they were to be pressed to *act* according to their knowledge ; and they were to be instructed to *worship God in spirit and in truth*. They had the Law and the Prophets, and in them there was an express promise made to their fathers, that in *their seed should all the earth be blessed*. The apostles therefore instructed the *Jews* how this promise was made good : they taught them that *Jesus* was this promised person, eminently known among them, and expected by them under the name of *the Christ*.

It was not long after the resurrection of our Saviour, that the apostles received a commission from Him to go into all nations, and to *make disciples* unto Him, *baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe whatever He had commanded them*. The *Holy Ghost* had been promised to be sent by our Lord ; and His *office* had been described, whilst our Saviour was with the disciples, and conversed openly with them : and during the forty days after His resurrection, they were commanded *not to depart from Jerusalem, till they had received the promise of the Father* made to them by Christ ; and which afforded so strong a confirmation of the truths taught by

Christ. The rule of faith therefore, in the beginning, was comprised in the short Creed of *One God the Father*, the Maker of all things ; and in *One Lord Jesus Christ* His Son ; and in the *Holy Ghost*, the Paraclet, sent by Christ. And all such as professed thus much were baptized, and deemed to be complete *Christians*.

When I say that such were deemed to be *complete Christians*, I do not mean that such had nothing further to learn or to do. They had the Scriptures to search : they were to observe the things there delivered concerning the nature, mission, and commission of Christ : they were to learn what was said concerning the kingdom of Christ, and its laws, and the several dispensations of God : they were to learn what was the office of Christ : they were to enquire what the prophets had taught about Christ : they were to be instructed in the peace of God offered by Christ : the conditions on which it was offered ; and in short into whatever they could discover relative to God, or to Christ, or to what He taught, or to themselves as His disciples. But then all these things were not required to be known *previous to baptism*, but were to be learned as men made a progress in the Word of God, that inexhaustible source of wisdom and knowledge.

The learned Dr. *Grabe* was of opinion, that the *Catechumens* were not, *previous* to their *baptism* instructed in the doctrine of *the conception of Jesus Christ from the Holy Ghost*, or, *of his birth of the Virgin Mary*; but that these doctrines were reserved for a *further opening after baptism*. *Vid. Annotata ad Bulli Judicium*, c. vi. It is indeed highly probable, that these and other doctrines were taught as circumstances arose, either to explain some things inculcated in the Gospels, or to avoid some thing erroneous. And hence it was, that the *original Creed* was enlarged, and more and more things inserted into it; and indeed all that has been added to it, seems to have been owing to these causes. Those who are desirous to see on what *particular occasions* articles have been added to the Creed, may consult those learned and great authors, Bishop *Pearson*, Bishop *Bull*, and his annotator, Dr. *Grabe*; the author of the *Critical History of the Creed*, and our ecclesiastical antiquarian, Mr. *Bingham*.

It is not my design to examine into the *history* of the *Creed*. All that I intend is, to shew how insensibly doctrines are changed: that, in a plain instance, a variation from the *words* of Scripture is, and has been the means of introducing a dif-

ferent doctrine from what is contained in them : that what is pretended to be an explication of Scripture, is often more hard to be understood than the Scriptures themselves are : that the additions and interpretations of men, often quite change the truths of the Gospel : that when in process of time one false notion is taught or established, *that* is made the foundation of another, and thus at length *transubstantiation* itself has been made the doctrine of Christ. I do not say, nor would I be understood to insinuate, that all and every change of doctrine is attended with consequences so gross, or so destructive of common sense as *transubstantiation* is, or even as some *καθωμιλημένοι διδαχαί*, *commonly taught doctrines*, are : but my view is to shew how the Gospel has been changed, and made liable to objections, which in itself it is not liable to. And if any objection is an obstruction to the reception of Christianity by any person whatever, it may merit consideration, where the fault lies,—whether in those who do not believe Christianity, because it seems to them (as it is represented) to contain doctrines incredible, or in those who *teach for doctrines the commandments of men*.

AN
ENQUIRY

WHEN THE
RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, OR FLESH, WAS FIRST
INSERTED INTO

THE PUBLIC CREEDS.

It seems in general agreed among learned men, that the Creed which goes under the name of the *Apostle's Creed*, was not composed in its present form by the *apostles*, but was made up at different times, partly from the articles required in the New Testament in order to baptism, and partly in opposition to *heretics* who arose in early days, and partly in opposition to Gentilism, and the doctrines introduced by such as were made converts from thence. The very short Creed, which at first was deemed sufficient to entitle men to *baptism*, was no other than a faith *in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ His Son our Lord, and in the Holy Ghost*. There might be some variation of *expression* in these articles ; but still the *sense* was the same ; and so long as these doctrines were closely adhered to, as practical, and useful in the reformation of

life, so long was Christianity preserved pure, and in its *virgin state*, and was a vital principle of right and true action. But as soon as men began not to be content with the simplicity of the Gospel, but were for introducing *knowledge* instead of regulation of manners, they made religion consist in metaphysics, and vain philosophy, and perverted the end and design of Christianity. Those who were instructed *as the truth is in Christ*, readily believed all the doctrines of Christ, and lived as men that had hopes in Christ. They believed that He was *Lord*, and *Judge* of all, that He was *ascended up into heaven*, and would *come again*; that there would be a *resurrection of the dead*, and a *judgment of quick and dead*; and that all were *to repent from evil works*. And therefore when the apostle was mentioning the *foundation*, or *first principles*, in which converts to Christ were instructed, he reckons nothing else but *faith towards God*, the *doctrine of Christ*, *repentance from dead works*, the *resurrection of the dead*, and *eternal judgment*. When he adds the *doctrine of baptisms*, and *laying on of hands*, it was because these were *rites* used at that time to all such as became converts to Christ, and were to be *baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. They were all instructed in these *rites*, that they might understand the *whole* of their initiation.

It is well known, that in the *heathen* world they

believed in *Gods many, and Lords many* : and among the *Jews*, there was a full expectation of one whom they called *the Messiah* ; a person in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed ; and who was to reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of whose kingdom there was to be no end. Hence the first article taught to a heathen was a belief in God, or *The One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth* : and to both Jew and heathen, a second was added, that *Jesus* was *the Christ*. And as He was to be believed in what He promised, and in fact He had promised to send *the Holy Ghost*, so a third great article of faith was added—that they did believe in *the Holy Ghost* : by which they meant, that they believed that the *Holy Ghost* was sent by Christ according to His promise. And thus was this article understood, when in the fourth century they first began to explain what they understood to be the meaning of—*I believe in the Holy Ghost*.

The first additions to the baptismal Creed seem to be made with design of forming right notions of the *Son of God* ; but it was long ere they added other points not immediately relative to *Him*. The insertions of, *the Holy Catholic Church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting*, did not make part of the *Baptismal Creed* before the middle of the fourth century. And as to the article of the *Resurrection of the Body*, Bishop *Pearson* cites no authority for it

earlier than *Ruffinus*. If he imagined, that it was not in *any* Creed before *Ruffinus's* days, he was certainly mistaken; for it occurs in some before his time, as will appear hereafter. It is the observation of that learned expositor of the "Creed, "that though we in our *English* Creed say, We "believe *the resurrection of the body*, yet neither "the *Greek* nor *Latin* ever delivered this article in "those terms, but in these, *The resurrection of "the flesh*." It follows presently in a note—"The *Greeks* always use, *σαρκὸς ἀνάστασις*; the "*Latins*, *Carnis Resurrectionem*. And this was to "be observed, because, being we read of *spiritual "bodies*, some would acknowledge the resurrection "of the body, who would not acknowledge the resurrection of the *flesh*." How far the *Greeks* in any Creed of theirs used *σαρκὸς ἀνάστασις*, *the resurrection of the flesh*, during the three first centuries, or even the *fourth*, (that century, famous for *Creed-making*) will appear from what follows.

But before I proceed, it will be necessary to observe, that there is not any such expression in the New Testament as *the resurrection of the flesh*; no, nor as what we have in our Creeds in the morning and evening service of our Church Liturgy, and in our Catechism, *the resurrection of the body*, or as it is in the Baptismal Creed, *the resurrection of the flesh*. The Scriptures often speak of *a resurrection*, and of *the resurrection of the dead*: but as to the resurrection of *the body*, or of the

flesh, there is not one word. And therefore that such article was required *at first*, to be professed in order to baptism, can never be proved. When *St. Paul* was at *Athens* he preached *Jesus* and the *resurrection*, *Acts* xvii. 18. And we find him frequently speaking of *the rising of the dead*. *If the dead rise not at all, why stand we in jeopardy every hour?* 1 Cor. xv. 30. And in the verse preceding — *If the dead rise not, why are they then baptized for the dead*. Be this place as obscure as you please, yet the phraseology is determinate and clear, that *the dead rise*: and that is the use I would make of it. And, if I mistake not, in this one chapter, the expression of *the resurrection of the dead* occurs at least ten times, and not once is there such a word as *the resurrection of the flesh*, or *the resurrection of the body*.

But not to leave this passage as if it were quite unintelligible, I would observe, that the apostle is here reasoning against some that denied the *resurrection of the dead*: and he argues, *If Christ be preached that He rose from the dead, How say some among you, that there is no resurrection of the dead?* 1 Cor. xv. 12. Having then made good his argument from the resurrection of Christ to the resurrection of others, ver. 23, and having treated of the reign of Christ in the following verses, he resumes his argument at ver. 29, *Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead?* If the dead do not rise, it is the highest folly for

any one to be initiated into a religion whose fundamental article is a belief of a good, *ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν*, *for those that die*. Why will any engage in a profession of future good to such as die? They that act upon such a principle must be guilty of gross folly, or gross absurdity.

But whether this be the meaning of this difficult passage or not, I cannot but observe, that when St. Paul apologized for himself before *Felix*, his language was the same as it was here—*This I confess, that I hope towards God, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust*. Acts xxiv. 15. He certainly intended an universal resurrection of all mankind; for *as by man came death, so also by man came the resurrection of the dead*. 1 Cor. xv. 21.

If we look into our Saviour's preaching, He never calls this otherwise than the *resurrection*, or *the resurrection of*, or, *from the dead*. Thus, *But as touching the resurrection of the dead have ye not read*. Matt. xxii. 31. The question put to Him was, *In the resurrection whose wife shall she be?* And His answer was,—*In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage*. They were certain of the *Sadducees* (*who deny that there is any resurrection*) Luke xx. 27. who put the question to our Lord,—*In the resurrection whose wife of them is she?* And the answer of our Lord is—*They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the*

dead—are the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, etc. ver. 35, 36, 37. When the apostles went to preach the Gospel in the world, they taught in such a mannner, that the Sadducees were grieved that they preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead. *Acts* iv. 2. And when the philosophers at Athens heard St. Paul preaching Jesus and the resurrection, *Acts* xvii. 18, they plainly enough understood him as preaching the resurrection of the dead, ver. 32. And as to St. Paul's own self, his great endeavour was, that he might attain the resurrection of the dead. *Phil.* iii. 11. And I have already observed, than when he laid down the first principles of the doctrines of Christ, One was the resurrection of the dead. *Heb.* vi. 2.

It may appear strange, that so often as mention is made of the resurrection of the dead in the New Testament, not once is there any mention of the resurrection of the body, or of the flesh. To raise the dead occurs, *Matt.* x. 8; *Acts* xxvi. 8. To raise up us, *1 Cor.* vi. 14; *2 Cor.* iv. 14. The dead are raised up, *Matt.* xi. 5. To raise from the dead, or the dead shall be raised up incorruptible, *1 Cor.* xv. 52. But still the body, or flesh, is is never mentioned as to be raised again. We have indeed notice taken of our waiting for the adoption, viz., the redemption of our body, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν, *Rom.* viii. 23. But as this relates to that state of happiness

which we are now *hoping* for, and which we are hereafter to enjoy, it is not a *resurrection* of our bodies, but a *freedom* or *deliverance from the bodies* that we bear about us, that the apostle has in view. And indeed when the question was put concerning the *resurrection* (which was thought by some as impossible as to make twice two equal to twenty), when the question was—*With what body shall they come?* the apostle does not answer, that men shall rise with their *present bodies*, or in the *flesh* which they bore about them, either *in their lives*, or at their *deaths*; but he treats the curious enquirer with no great compliment, and answers, *Thou fool*, and adds, *that God will give us such a body as he thinks proper on such occasions.* 1 Cor. xv. 36—38.

There is indeed one text which says that Christ is *the Saviour of the body*. Eph. v. 23. But the apostle is not there speaking of the *body of flesh* which at present we all bear about us, but of a *body mystical* or *political*, of which Christ is the head, *viz.*, the *Church*. He is *the Saviour* of all Christians, whom He came to save from all their sins. And, in another Epistle, the same apostle assures the *Romans*—*If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by His Spirit that dwelleth in you.* Rom. viii. 11. But here too the apostle is not speaking of the *resurrection* at the

last day, but concerning what was to be done at *present*; not of what was to happen *after* our deaths, but of what we are to do *before* our souls are separated from our bodies. *To be carnally-minded*, says he, *is death*; but *to be spiritually-minded*, *is life and peace*—But you [believers in Christ] *are not in the Flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.*—And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life, because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead [i. e., the Spirit of God] dwell in you, ver. 9, He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies, i. e., make you mortify the deeds of the body, ver. 13, and live according to the Spirit, or mind the things of the Spirit, whilst you are here upon earth.

The doctrine then of the Gospel being thus uniform concerning the *resurrection of, or, from the dead*, the apostles never required the belief of any particular *modus*, or *manner* of it. They never said anything of the resurrection of the *flesh*, nor *body*; but left such matters to be found out in after times. Whatever might be the notions of uninspired men, either that there was to be a resurrection of the *flesh*, or of some sort of *body spiritualised*, yet nothing of this was made an Article of Faith, or was inserted into any *public Creed*, or required of any convert to be professed, in order to baptism. And if we pass from the

New Testament, *Barnabas* and *Clemens* of Rome mention no more than *the resurrection*; and not any particular *modus* of it, or the resurrection of the *flesh*, vide *Barnabas*, c. xxi., *Clemens*, c. xxiv.; *Clemens* indeed in his second Epistle, mentions the resurrection of the flesh: but that is allowed to be not genuine. *Ignatius* too speaks as the Scriptures do,—*The Father will raise up us. Ep. ad Trallianos*. And in the larger Epistle to the *Ephesians*, he speaks of the resurrection, ἐκ νεκρῶν, *from the dead*: but he never mentions anything of a resurrection of the flesh.

But soon after this the language changed in Christian writers, and *Justin Martyr* tells us, that Christ *shall come a second time, as the prophets had foretold*, when τὰ σώματα ἀναγερῇ πάντων τῶν γενομένων ἀνθρώπων, *He shall raise the bodies of all men that have been*. p. 87. This was *Justin's* opinion; but it was not in any *baptismal Creed*: for he tells us of no other article, but that all were baptized, ἐπ' ὀνόματος τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄλων καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ, καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου, *in the name of God the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit*. p. 34. And hence it is that he speaks of *Jesus as the Son of the true God*, υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τῷ ὄντως θεοῦ, and tells us in what rank or order they placed Him, καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ χώρᾳ ἔχοντες, *holding Him in the second place, and the prophetic Spirit in the third. Just. Apol.*,

2^{da}, p. 60. But he takes no notice of any article of any *Creed* as containing the notion of the *resurrection* of the *flesh*, whatever his own philosophical notion of the *resurrection* might be. It was soon after this that *Polycarp* suffered, and he mentions *the resurrection* twice in his Epistle to the *Philippians*, c. ii., 5. In the former place it is, ἡμᾶς ἐγείρει, *he will raise up* us: in the *second* it is, that Christ *promised*, ἐγείραι ἡμᾶς ἐκ νεκρῶν, *to raise up* us *from the dead*. And in this he speaks as the Scriptures do. But then in the epistle of the Church of *Smyrna*, that gives an account of his martyrdom, a prayer of the martyrs is recited, wherein he mentions the *resurrection of eternal life, soul, and body*, ἀνάστασις ζωῆς αἰωνίου, ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος. But by the time when this letter was wrote, the notion seems to have prevailed among Christians, that the *body* was to be raised, though it was not yet got into any of their Creeds. For soon after the middle of the Second Century, disputes arose about the Resurrection, the *heathens* objecting to the possibility of it, and the *Christians* endeavouring to answer the objections they met with. The enquiry was, whether there was to be a resurrection of the *soul* alone, or of the *whole man*, consisting of *body* and *soul*? And then a second question was, whether the *flesh*, the *very flesh* which now we bear about us, was to be raised up again?

The writers of that time still extant, contended

for the *resurrection of the flesh*, together with the soul. *Theophilus* Bishop of *Antioch* tells *Autolichus*, (a learned heathen who had wrote against the Christian religion) ἀναγέλπει σου τήν σάρκα ἀθάνατον σὺν τῇ ψυχῇ ὁ θεός. *God raises up the flesh, and makes it immortal with the soul.* p. 74. And *Athenagoras* wrote a peculiar Tract on this subject, and pleads that *the man* consisting of *body and soul*, is to be *raised again*: but there does not appear to be any *Creed* which established such a doctrine. For whatever private persons might imagine to be *true*, was not instantly to be *professed* as an *Article of Faith*, necessary to be *believed* in order to *baptism*.

The next in point of time is *Irenæus*, if he be not more properly contemporary with *Theophilus* and *Athenagoras*; for *Irenæus* published his books against heresies, A.D. 176, or 177. And *Athenagoras's Apology* was wrote about two or three years after; and *Theophilus's* tract was wrote about 170. There are in *Irenæus* a shorter and a longer paraphrase of the grand principles of the Gospel drawn up almost like *Creeds*. But as they do not agree in *words*, nor consist of the *same articles*, but differ in many instances, they cannot be looked upon as *Creeds* of any Church, but as summaries of the doctrines of Christianity, drawn up in this author's own form. The shorter summary seems to be most like a *Creed*, as it contains the doctrine "which many barbarous nations, dili-

“gently keeping the ancient tradition,” observe as their rule. “Believing in one God, Maker of “heaven and earth, and of all things in them by “Christ Jesus the Son of God, who through His “most eminent love towards his creature, under- “went that generation which was of a Virgin, He “by Himself uniting man to God, and having suf- “fered under *Pontius Pilate*, and being rose again, “and taken up in splendor, will come again in glory, “a Saviour of them that are saved, and a Judge of “them that are judged, sending into eternal fire “the perverters of truth, and the despisers of His “Father, and of His own coming again.” l. i., c. x.

In unum Deum credentes fabricatorem cæli et terræ et omnium quæ in eis sunt per Christum Jesum Dei Filium. Qui propter eminentissimam erga figmentum suum dilectionem, eam quæ esset ex Virgine generationem sustinuit, ipse per se hominem adunans Deo, et passus sub Pontio Pilato, et resurgens, et in claritate receptus, in gloria venturus Salvator eorum qui salvantur et judex eorum qui judicantur, et mittens in ignem æternum transfiguratōres veritatis et contemptores Patris sui et Adventus ejus. lib. iii., c. iv.

In this *summary* of Christian doctrines we find no notice taken of the *resurrection* of the *flesh*, or *body*, at all: nor indeed of any resurrection, further than as it may be *inferred* from Christ being a Judge and Avenger of such as deserve punishment or reward. And indeed it is a *defective* re-

presentation of the ancient Creed, as it takes no notice of the *Holy Ghost*, notwithstanding it contains a fuller exposition of some points than was originally taught.

In the other and larger account of what he says the Church received from the apostles and their disciples, he is much more explicit. *Εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν πατέρα, etc.* "The Church received a faith in one " God the Father Almighty, the Maker of heaven " and earth and seas, and all things in them; and " in one Jesus Christ the Son of God, who became " flesh for our salvation; and in the Holy Ghost " who preached by the prophets the dispensa- " tions, and the comings, and generation of the " Virgin, and the passion, and the *resurrection* " *from the dead*, and the assumption of the beloved " Christ Jesus our Lord in the flesh, and His com- " ing from the heavens in the glory of the Father, " that He may gather together all things, and *raise* " *up all flesh of all men*, that to Christ Jesus our " Lord and God, and Saviour, and King, according " to the good pleasure of the invisible Father, every " knee should bend of things in heaven, and " things on earth, and things under the earth, and " every tongue should confess to Him; and that He " may do a right judgment in all, *viz.* the spiritual " things of wickedness, and the angels that trans- " gressed and have been in apostacy, and the " impious, and unjust, and transgressors, and blas- " phemers, He may send into everlasting fire, but

"to the just and holy, and observers of His commands, and to such as continue from the beginning in the love of Him, or repent, granting life, He may give incorruption, and vest them with everlasting glory." *Irenæ.*, lib. i., c. 10.

In this longer paraphrastical account of the doctrines "received from the apostles and their disciples," there are several articles which were never put into any *Baptismal* Creed. Many particular doctrines are here said to be *preached by the Holy Ghost*, which a candidate for *baptism* was never required to profess at that time. The *resurrection of the flesh* began now to be a currently received doctrine; but yet it was left out of the *shorter* summaries; whereas all fundamental doctrines were necessarily inserted into the Creeds. But when men collected their own sentiments, and at large recited such things as suited their particular purposes, they put into such *summaries* whatever they thought proper, and did not confine themselves to the precision of a Creed.

And this we find to be the case of *Tertullian*: he has done exactly the same as *Irenæus* did: he has drawn up no less than *three* formulas of faith; and in *one* of these no mention is made of the *resurrection of the flesh*, though that article appears in the other two. It is plainly an inference drawn from the doctrines taught in those times about the *resurrection*, and not an article of any public Creed. For when this writer comes to consider,

Quo titulo spes ista præscripta sit.—On what authority the hope of the resurrection of the flesh was founded? He answers, *Unum opinor apud omnes edictum Dei pendet, resurrectio mortuorum, The declaration of God is but one to all, the resurrection of the dead. Tert. de Resur. carnis, c. xviii.*

In his book against *Praxeas*, *Tertullian* recites what he says he *always* believed, viz., “*In unicum Deum*—*unici Dei sit et Filius Sermo ipsius qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt et sine quo factum est nihil. Hunc missum a Patre in Virginem, et ex ea natum hominem et Deum, filium hominis et filium Dei, et cognominatum Jesum Christum. Hunc passum, hunc mortuum, et sepultum secundum Scripturas, et resuscitatum a Patre, et in cælos resumptum, sedere ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos, qui exinde miserit secundum promissionem suam a Patre Spiritum Sanctum, Paracletum, Sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum.*” i.e., “He believed in one God,—and that his Word was the Son of the one God; who proceeded from him; by whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made. [He believed] that he was sent by or from the Father into the Virgin, and from her was born Man and God, the Son of Man, and the Son of God, and named Jesus Christ. That he suffered, that he died, that he

"was buried, according to the Scriptures, and
 "raised up by the Father, and taken up into hea-
 "ven, sits at the right hand of the Father, will
 "come to judge the quick and dead: who from
 "thence sent according to his promise from the
 "Father, the Holy Ghost the Paraclet, the Sanc-
 "tifier of their Faith, who believe in the Father,
 "and Son, and Holy Ghost." *Tertull. adv.*
Praxeam, c. i.

Tertullian tells us, that this doctrine was the general doctrine that had been taught among Christians from the beginning. "Hanc regulam
 "ab initio Evangelii decucurrisset, etiam ante priores
 "quosque hæreticos, nedum ante Praxeam hesternum."
 "That *this rule had been observed and*
 "*adhered to from the very beginning of the Gospel;*
 "*that it was prior to all heretics that had been in*
 "*the Christian Church, not to say Praxeas that*
 "*was but as yesterday.*" Every one must see that in this rule, no mention is made of the resurrection of the *flesh*. A *resurrection* is professed, because *the quick and dead* are to be judged by Christ; but as to the resurrection of the *flesh* or *body*, he does not tell us, that that notion was delivered from the first preaching of the Gospel.

It is true, that he delivers us another form of faith, in his book, *de Velandis Virginibus*, shorter in many points than that before recited, but with an addition of the clause of the resurrection of the *flesh*. His rule in this place is, "Credendi in

“unicum Deum omnipotentem mundi conditorem,
 “et Filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex Vir-
 “gine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia
 “die resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in cælis,
 “sedentem nunc ad dextram Patris, venturum
 “judicare vivos et mortuos per carnis etiam resur-
 “rectionem.” “To believe in one God, Almighty,
 “Maker of the world, and in his Son Jesus Christ,
 “born of the Virgin *Mary*, crucified under *Pontius*
 “*Pilate*, the third day raised from the dead, taken
 “up into heaven, now sitting at the right hand of
 “the Father, will come to judge the quick and
 “dead, even by the resurrection of the flesh,”
cap. 1. This rule of faith he calls *unalterable, not*
to be amended, immobilis et irreformabilis; and
 indeed this has more the appearance of a true
 symbol, than any of the others which *Tertullian*
 has recited. But yet those words, *per carnis etiam*
resurrectionem, even by the resurrection of the flesh,
 are so manifest an *additional explication* of the
 preceding words, *the dead*, that if we admit this
 to have been the Creed of the *African Church*,
 yet still the *explication* must be struck out as no
 part of the Creed. But what evinces it not to
 have been a *Creed* at all, is, that here is no men-
 tion of the *Holy Ghost*, a doctrine universally
 taught to all that professed Christianity; and
 which *Tertullian* enlarges upon in this very treatise
 afterwards.

Nor is his *third form, or rule of faith*, which he

lays down in his book, *De Præscriptione Hereticorum*, any Creed of any Church, but only a summary of the doctrines of the Gospel, drawn up by himself, that his adversaries might see and know what it was that he undertook to defend. This was—"Unum omnino Deum esse; nec alium præter Mundi conditorem, qui universa de nihilo produxerit per Verbum suum primo omnium demissum. Id Verbum Filium ejus appellatum, in nomine Dei varie visum a patriarchis, in prophetis semper auditum, postremo delatum ex Spiritu Patris Dei et virtute, in Virginem Mariam, carnem factum in utero ejus, et ex ea natum egisse Jesum Christum, exinde prædicasse novam legem, et novam promissionem regni cœlorum: Virtutes fecisse: fixum cruci: tertia die resurrexisse; in cœlos ereptum sedisse ad dextram Patris; misisse vicariam vim Spiritus Sancti qui credentes agat; venturum cum claritate ad sumendos sanctos in vitæ æternæ et promissorum cœlestium fructum, et ad profanos adjudicandos igni perpetuo, facta utriusque partis resurrectione cum carnis restitutione." c. 13.

There is but one God; no other besides the Maker of the world, who produced all things out of nothing, by his Word first of all sent down. That Word being called his Son, was in the name of God in different manners seen by the patriarchs, always heard in the prophets, lastly, of the Spirit and Power of God the Father, brought into the Virgin

Mary, made flesh in her womb, and being born of her became Jesus Christ: from that time preached the new laws and new promise of the kingdom of heaven; worked miracles, was crucified, rose again the third day, being taken into heaven, he sat at the right hand of the Father, he sent the Power of the Holy Ghost to act in his place, who should operate on believers; he was to come in glory to take the holy to the enjoyment of life eternal, and the happiness of heaven, and to judge the wicked to everlasting fire. Both parts of us being raised up, with the restoration of the flesh.

Tertullian in this place undertakes to prove, that this rule was instituted by Christ, and that among Christians, there were no debates or controversies about these things, unless what heresies had introduced, and such as made men heretics. "Hæc regula a Christo, ut probabitur, instituta; nullas habet apud nos quæstiones, nisi quas hæreses inferunt, et quæ hæreticos faciunt." *Ibid.*

Upon these several Formulas of Faith one cannot but observe,

1. The expressions made use of, are so different in the articles which correspond together in sense, that either none of them was the established Creed of the Church, made use of at the admission of proselytes to baptism: or if one of them was, it is impossible to say which was. It cannot be this last, which he says *was instituted by Christ*; for Christ never instituted such Creed: nor did Christ

ever teach any thing about the *restoration of the flesh*. Nor could it be the *second*, because there is no mention of the *Holy Ghost* in it: and if we admit the *first* formula, that has said nothing about the resurrection of the *flesh*. The truth is, *Tertullian* delivered in his own words what he took to be the *sense* or general doctrines among Christians; and as he was a zealous assertor of the *resurrection of the flesh*, and had wrote professedly for that notion, it is not to be wondered at, that he should treat this opinion as a doctrine of Christianity, though it was no more than his own *explication* of the doctrine of the Gospel, in his warm way made to be an institution of Christ's.

2. It is certain, that the controversy about the *resurrection of the FLESH*, did not begin till the middle, or near the end of the second century: And then, as philosophers objected to the *resurrection* itself from the common topics, *How could flesh devoured by beasts or fishes, and thus become parts of those animals; or perhaps reduced by fire to ashes, or dispersed by seas and rivers, be restored?* *Athenagoras*, and *Theophilus*, and *Tertullian*, undertook a defence of this notion; and taught, that it was no ways beyond the power of *Almighty* God to restore to every one the *flesh* he once had. How far they succeeded, is not the point at present: they might have shewn, that the *resurrection* of the *flesh* is no where taught in Scripture: the resurrection of the *dead*, is no

ways liable to any of the difficulties which the other notion may be liable to. For may there not be a resurrection of the *dead*, without the resurrection of the *flesh*? May not the *dead person* be raised to life, and have a *body* given to him suitable to the place he is to have? May not the *thinking, conscious* person be restored, though he has not that restored which has no *thought*, nor *consciousness*, belonging to it? And why should Christianity be encumbered with notions that the Scriptures have not so much as once mentioned? But these men beginning, others followed; and at length, it grew to be the doctrine of the *Church*; but it was not inserted into any *Creed*, till long after these times; nor did it make a distinct Article of Faith, as now it does, how strenuously soever it was defended by the greatest advocates in those days.

Nothing material to this point passed from this time till *Origen*, about the year 240, or thereabouts: and in his works we meet with some instances of Creeds, in which one might expect to find an article relative to the resurrection of the *body* or *flesh*, had any baptismal *Creed* contained such article. In his Commentary on *St. John*, he gives us this form: *Πρώτον*, says he, *πίστεύουσιν ὅτι εἰς ἑστὶν ὁ θεὸς ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας, καὶ καταρτίσας, καὶ ποιήσας ἐκ τῷ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα* χρηρὲς δὲ καὶ πιστεύειν ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ πάσῃ τῇ περὶ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν θεό-

τητα καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα ἀληθεία. Δεῖ δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πιστεῦναι πνεῦμα· καὶ ὅτι αὐτεξέσσιοι ὄντες κολαζόμεθα μὲν ἐφ' οἷς ἁμαρτάνομεν· τιμώμεθα δὲ ἐφ' οἷς εὖ πράττομεν. “*Believe that there is one God, who created all things, and directs and made all things from not being to be. You must believe too that Jesus Christ is Lord; and in every truth concerning him, both as to his Divinity and his Humanity. You must also believe in the Holy Ghost; and that we being free agents, shall be punished for our sins, and shall be rewarded for those things that we do well.*” Origen, Com. in Johan., tom. 2, p. 397. This is not indeed a direct proper *Creed*, but yet as the great articles into which all Christians were baptized, viz., the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, and the belief of future punishments and rewards is so distinctly recited; and no mention is made of a resurrection of any *body* or *flesh*, one may reasonably infer, that no *Creed* in his time contained any such notion.

There is another treatise, said to be *Origen's*, and wrote against the *Marcionites*, in which the writer sets down a direct form of *Creed*, just as *Tertullian* had done, that it might appear in one view, what he designed to maintain, or make good. It stands thus: “*Ἐνα θεὸν καὶ κτίστην καὶ δημιουργὸν τῶν ἀπάντων εἶναι πεπίστευκα, καὶ τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ θεὸν λόγον, ὁμοσίσιον, ἀεὶ ὄντα, καὶ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων καιρῶν ἀνθρωποῦν ἐκ Μαρίας ἀναλαβόντα, καὶ*

τῆτον σταυρωθέντα καὶ ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν. Πιστεύω δὲ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι τῷ ἀεὶ ὄντι. i. e., *I have believed that there is one God, the Creator and Maker of all things : and God the Word, from him, consubstantial, ever existing, and in the last times taking man of Mary, him crucified, and risen from the dead. I believe also in the Holy Ghost, who always is.* Orig., c. Marcion, p. 3.

One part of this debate is about the *resurrection*, wherein *Marinus a Bardesianist* contends, that not the *body we bear about us*, a fluctuating substance, different from itself at different ages, but *spiritual bodies*, or rather the *soul alone*, will rise. *Adamantius*, i. e., *Origen* all the way insists on it, that the *very body which encompasses us*, is to arise. There is nothing in the *Creed* recited, any ways relative to the *resurrection*, except it be that Christ arose, ἐκ νεκρῶν, *from the dead*. And if there had been in the usual forms of the *Creed*, into which proselytes or others were baptized, any such article as the *resurrection of the flesh*, it is very probable that *Adamantius* would have put it into his *Creed* : especially since so great part of this dialogue turned upon this subject. But instead of that, this *Creed* ends as the *Creeds* of those days did, (and even many years after) with the belief of the *Holy Ghost*. But as this *Creed* has certain marks of later times in it, what regard is due to it, is left to the reader's judgment.

I proceed next to *Cyprian*, who does not take

any notice of any such article as the *resurrection of the flesh* in the baptismal creed of his time. He has in two several places taken notice of the question put to the person to be baptized, "Credis remissionem peccatorum, et vitam eternam per Sanctum Ecclesiam?" *Do you believe remission of sins, and life everlasting through the Holy Church?* Ep. 69. And again, "Credis in Vitam eternam, et remissionem peccatorum per Sanctum Ecclesiam?" *Do you believe in life everlasting, and remission of sins through the Holy Church?* Ep. 79, Edit. Fell. Here we first meet with this new article of *remission of sins* through the *Holy Church*; and by the manner of putting it to the catechumen, this was an article of the Creed: but he never mentions the *resurrection of the flesh* as in the Creed; nor did it in his time stand in the place that afterwards it obtained, *between* the article of *forgiveness of sins*, and, *life everlasting*. It seems to have been believed currently enough by particular persons, but not yet taken into any Creed.

About the times of *Cyprian*, i. e., about 250, flourished that great man, *Gregory* bishop of *Neocæsarea*, or *Thaumaturgus*, famed for the many *miracles* he is said to have worked; he has given us a *Creed*, said to have come down from heaven. The Virgin *Mary*, it seems, put *St. John the Evangelist* upon explaining to young *Gregory*, the *mystery of godliness*: and the apostle was very

ready to gratify the Virgin, and *Gregory* instantly committed what was said to writing. The formula of faith is very precise and minute, as to what we are to believe concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; but there is not a word concerning *the resurrection of the flesh*, or even the *resurrection* of Christ himself. See the creed in *Gregory Nyssenes Life of Thaumaturgus*, vol. iii., p. 546, but it is needless to transcribe a thing that manifests itself to be a dream or a forgery, after the times of the *wonder-worker*. If the people of *Neocæsarea*, so strictly adhered to this form of words, as *Gregory of Nyssa* assures us, it is evident, that they had not any one word in their Creed about the *resurrection* of the *flesh*.

I come next to the *Fourth* Century, when the Arian controversy began; and the first Creed that here occurs, was that drawn up by *Alexander of Alexandria*, and sent by him to *Alexander of Byzantium*; it was a circular letter, very long, very full of complaints against *Arius*, and his notions, and very full of angry zeal; it was wrote A.D. 318. And herein he says—*We believe a resurrection from the dead, whose first fruits was our Lord Jesus Christ,—who in the end of ages came down to men to take away sins, who was crucified and dead without any imminution of the Divinity itself, rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Majesty.* I will give you here the words of this Prelate, so

far as the present debate is concerned. Τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν οἶδαμεν ἥς ἀπαρχὴ γέγονεν ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, σῶμα φορέσας ἀληθῶς καὶ οὐ δοκῇσει ἐκ τῆς θεοτόκου Μαρίας, ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας ἐπιδημήσας τῷ γένει ἀνθρώπων σταυρωθεὶς, καὶ ἀποθανὼν, ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ τὰντα τῆς ἐαυτῆ θεότητος ἡττων γεγεννημένος, ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀναληφείς ἐν οὐρανῶις, καθημένος ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης. *Theodoret*, lib. i., c. 4.

The debates about *Arianism* were carried on for several years together, *Alexander* not only writing particular letters to all the bishops he knew, to get them to subscribe to his opinions, but writing common *circular* letters to all he could, to engage them in his party: at length the famous Council of *Nice* was called A.D. 325. The Creed there established was remarkably canvassed; and as if it had been sent from heaven to those 318 fathers, it was made the standard of *true faith* for many years. It ran in these words, "I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made both those in heaven and those in earth, who for us men and for our salvation, came

“down from heaven, and was incarnate and was made man: he suffered and rose again the third day, and ascended into heaven, and will come again to judge the quick and dead; and in the Holy Ghost.” This was all the Creed. Then there follow some anathema’s against *Arius* and his followers; but as to the *resurrection of the flesh*, there is not one word, nor was it yet an article of the Creed.

Whilst this Council was sitting, and great debates were carrying on, occasioned by some unscriptural expressions and notions used on *both* sides, I mean by *Arius* on the one side, and by the *Nicene Fathers* themselves on the other, *Eusebius* recited a Creed, καθὼς παρελάβομεν ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ κατηχήσει, καὶ ὅτε τὸ λούτρον ἐλαμβάνομεν, καθὼς ἀπὸ τῶν θείων γραφῶν μεμαθήκαμεν, καὶ ὡς ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ ἐπιστεύομεν τε καὶ ἐδιδάσκομεν, i. e., “*As he had received it from bishops who lived before him, and as he had been instructed at first when he was initiated into Christianity, and as when he was baptized, and as he had learnt from the Holy Scriptures, and as he believed and taught both when he was a presbyter and when he was a bishop.*” He then recites his Creed; which though in some words little varying from the Creed professed by the *Nicene fathers*, yet it has not the least word concerning the *resurrection of the flesh*. It contains

no more than the *three* great articles of the Christian Faith, *viz.*, a *belief in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, and that he died and suffered for us, and ascended into heaven, and will come to judge the quick and dead; and in the Holy Ghost, believing each of these to be truly subsisting.*

However it is proper to give this Creed fully in his own words, because this was the Creed *Eusebius* was *baptized into*, and which he constantly *used himself*, and which he declared to contain his *true sense*, and in which he would continue to his *life's end*, as he called God and Jesus Christ to *witness*. "We believe in one God, the Father
 "Almighty, Maker of all things visible and in-
 "visible: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word
 "of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of
 "Life, the only begotten Son, the first born of
 "every creature, begotten of God the Father
 "before all ages, by whom all things were made.
 "Who for our salvation became incarnate, and
 "conversed among men, who suffered and rose
 "again the third day, he ascended to the Father,
 "and will come again to judge both the quick and
 "dead. We believe also in one Holy Ghost. And
 "each of these to be and exist, the Father to be
 "truly a Father, the Son to be truly a Son, and
 "the Holy Ghost truly a Holy Ghost, as our
 "Lord when He sent His disciples to preach, said,

"Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name
"of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost." Nic-
ceph., lib viii., c. 22; Socra., l. i., c. 8. It is
needless to transcribe this Creed in its original,
since there is not a word about the *resurrection* of
either *body* or *flesh* in it, nor had that article
hitherto obtained a place in the Creed, as it now
in a little time began to do.

Arius was deposed upon what passed at the
Council of *Nice*: and some endeavours had been
used to bring him back to *Alexandria* by *Eusebius*
of *Nicomedia*, and *Theognis* of *Nice*. But *Atha-*
nasius was obstinate and inflexible. Our histo-
rians tell us, that a certain presbyter had insinu-
ated into the Emperor's sister *Constantia*, how
much injustice had been done to *Arius* by the
Council of *Nice*; and that she upon her death, not
daring to speak a word to the Emperor in behalf
of *Arius*, recommends this presbyter to her brother,
testifying his care and diligence, and religious
regard he had shewn to her. This presbyter,
growing in time into high favour with the Emperor,
took an opportunity of suggesting to him, that
Arius was really of the same opinion with the
Nicene Council; that if he would permit him to
come into his presence, he would assent to the
Council before him: and upon this the Emperor
wrote a letter to *Arius* to come to him. This is
the story that *Socrates* has told, lib. i., c. 25. It
is much more probable that this is not the truth;

but it is not at present worth while to refute this fiction. *Arius* and *Euzoius* were brought into the Emperor's presence, and they delivered to him this formula of their faith. Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτωρα· καὶ εἰς κύριον ἡσῶν χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων γεγενημένον θεὸν λόγον, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τάτε ἐν τοῖς ἑρανοῖς, καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· τὸν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τὰς ἑρανοὺς καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἵωνος, καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, καὶ εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων; i. e., "*We believe in one God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ the Lord, His Son, begotten of Him before all ages, God the Word, by whom all things were made which are in heaven, and which are on earth, who descended, and was incarnate, and suffered, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, and will come to judge the quick and dead, and in the Holy Spirit, and in the resurrection of the flesh, and in the life in the world to come, and in the kingdom of heaven, and in the Catholic Church of God, from one end of the earth to the other.*" Socrat., lib. i., c. 26.

Here one cannot but observe, that this is the *first* Creed wherein we meet with the *resurrection of the flesh*, inserted as a distinct article by *Arius*.

It was drawn up upon a particular occasion, to engage the favour of *Constantine*; and if not only this article, but some others are professed, which never were in any antecedent Creed, it may raise a just suspicion, that some artifice was used to obtain an interest, or to secure it in the Emperor. " *This faith,*" says *Arius*, " we have learnt from the *Holy Gospels.*" What *faith* does he mean? Why truly, what can be "*learnt only from what our Lord said to His disciples, Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" Whence then came all the new articles,—*The resurrection of the flesh, the Catholic Church of God, from one end of the earth to the other—the kingdom of heaven,—the life in the world to come,—*whence, I say, were these articles? The first of these is no where taught in the Scriptures: and this is the *first Creed* in which these articles are professed: for we see *Eusebius's* Creed, according to which he was baptized, and which he used always at baptizing others, has no such articles; nor is it an article of the *Nicene Creed*; nor of *Alexander's* Creed at *Alexandria*; nor of *Gregory Thaumaturgus's*; nor indeed of any Creed in former times. This was therefore a private Creed of *Arius*; drawn up to serve a particular occasion; and never used in the Church as a *baptismal creed*; and though it contains in it the article of the *resurrection of the flesh*, yet that doctrine did not

prevail till after these times, so as to be inserted into any public Creeds. However, it must be owned, that this Creed was approved by a synod at *Jerusalem*, held in the 30th year of the reign of *Constantine*, A.D. 335, or 336, who in a synodical Epistle to the Church at *Alexandria*, and to all the Churches in *Egypt*, etc., gave them notice of their receiving *Arius*, and those of his friends to communion, upon their receiving this Creed.

I find in *Binius's* Councils, Vol. I., p. 492, mention made of a *Roman* synod held by Pope *Julius*, and one hundred and sixteen bishops, in the 4th year of the reigns of *Constantius* and *Constans*, Oct. i., Indication 6, wherein a Creed is recited, much the same with the *Nicene*, and not adding a word further than *I believe in the Holy Ghost*. But this Council is justly suspected to be a forged Council, since *Julius* was raised to the Pontificate A.D. 337; and the 4th year of *Constantius* and *Constans* was A.D. 343; and Indiction vi. was in the year 347; add to this, that according to this pretended council, *Felicianus* and *Maximianus* were consuls; whereas *Titianus* was consul with *Felicianus* in that year. From all this it appears, that this *Roman* synod was a mere forgery; at least it may be justly suspected.

But whatever becomes of this synod, we are told of a *Roman* council held under Pope *Julius*, in the year of our Lord 340, whilst *Athanasius* was at *Rome*, in which his famous Creed was pub-

lished. *Baronius* fixes it to *this* year; and so does *Binius*: and the former tells us, that this Creed, together with the acts of this synod, was placed among the archives of the *Roman* Church, and after many years was there found, and published to the world. This Creed is express in saying, *At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works.* The great difficulty is, how a Creed of this famous man came to *lie hid* so long as this did? The truth is, it is now granted by all not to be *Athanasius's* composition: it is now granted not to be of so early a date as *Julius's* days: and its latest and most zealous defender conceives it to be drawn up by *Hilary* of *Arles*, very near *one hundred* years after the time to which *Baronius* fixes it, *viz.*, A.D. 429. It is not worth the while therefore to enquire further, either into the author, or into his Creed; since we shall find the article we are in search after to be crept into the *Western* Creeds, before the times of *Hilary* of *Arles*.

Whilst *Athanasius* was at *Rome*, submitting himself and his cause to the judgment of the Pope of *Rome*, (who had no manner of jurisdiction over him, or over his adversaries) a council was held at *Antioch*, A.D. 341, of *ninety*, others say *ninety-seven*, others say of *ninety-nine* bishops. It was held, *Marcellinus* and *Probinus* Coss., *Constantius* the Emperor being then at *Antioch*. *Athanasius* scruples not to call this Emperor, he-

retic, and *most impious*, αἱρετικὸν ὄντα, and ἀσεβεστάτον, in his treatise *De Synodis*, p. 870, 894. Though when he wrote his apology to this very *Constantius*, he calls him several times θεοφιλέστατος, *most beloved of God*: and in his first oration against the *Arians* θεοσεβέστατος and φιλάνθρωπος, *most religious and humane*, p. 288.

N.B. This first oration was wrote near thirty-six years after *Arius* was condemned, *i. e.*, A.D. 361; Πρὸ τριάκοντα καὶ ἑξ ἔτων. *Athan.*, p. 305.

They seem to be perfectly unprejudiced persons; they disclaimed the name of *Arians*; and they professed an impartial resolution to reform whatever they thought amiss in the Church. They met, and examined into the case of *Athanasius*, and his *return*, and his taking possession of the Church of *Alexandria*. He had taken possession of his Church contrary to the rules of the Church; for as he was removed from his bishoprick by a council, he could not be restored otherwise than by a council. In this council there were three or four formula's of faith drawn up. In the *first*, they tell us what they had *learnt*,—that the Son having “πάσαν τὴν πατρικὴν αὐτῷ βεβλήν συνεκπεπληροκότα, πεπονθέναι, καὶ ἐγγεγέρθαι καὶ εἰς οὐρανὸς ἀνηλθῆναι, καὶ ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς καθέζεσθαι, καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρίναι ζώντας καὶ νεκρούς, καὶ διαμένοντα βασιλέα καὶ θεὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα,” *i. e.*, “We believe—that the Son having fulfilled

“all His Father’s will, suffered, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father, and will come to judge the quick and dead, and will continue King and God for ever. We believe also in the Holy Ghost.” Had these fathers stopped here, they had only done as the Council of Nice had done, and no one had had reason to complain. But they go on in a very remarkable manner, and much to the present purpose. “We believe in the Holy Ghost, εἰ δὲ δεῖ προσθεῖναι, πιστεύομεν καὶ περὶ σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως, καὶ ζωῆς αἰωνίου, i. e., if we ought to add to it, we believe also concerning the resurrection of the flesh, and life everlasting” Socr., l. ii., c. 10. Athanasius has given us the same form in his treatise *De Synodis*, p. 892. This certainly puts it beyond all dispute, that no clause was in their baptismal Creeds concerning the resurrection of the flesh, at that time. Soon after this, as it were repenting of this Creed, as Athanasius speaks, or condemning it as Socrates, they wrote—

A second, more large and full; expressing their sentiments concerning the Son, and the Holy Ghost more minutely; in such manner that the proper person of each, His order and glory, might be better understood. But still they went no farther in this Creed, than to declare their sentiments concerning the Son’s coming to judge the quick and dead, and their belief in the Holy Ghost,

given to believers for consolation, and sanctification, and perfection. So *Athanasius*, *ibid.* This second formula not being to their minds,

A third was drawn up by *Theophronius* bishop of *Tyana*, to which they all subscribed. This was in this form. *I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the Creator and Maker of all things, from whom are all things; and in His only begotten Son, God, Word, Power, and Wisdom, Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom are all things, begotten of the Father before ages, perfect God of perfect God, and being with the Father, ἐν πρόσωπῳ, in substance, came down from heaven in these last days; and, born of a Virgin, according to the Scriptures, became man, suffered, and rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven and sat at the right hand of His Father. And shall come again with glory and power to judge the quick and dead, and shall continue for ever. And in the Holy Ghost, the Paraclet, the Spirit of truth, whom God promised by the prophet to pour out upon His servants, and the Lord promised to send to His disciples, whom He also sent, as the Acts of the Apostles testify.*

There were ninety bishops, says *Athanasius*, that met at *Antioch* at the dedication of the Church there, *Marcellinus* and *Probinus* being consuls, A.D. 341. A few months after, μετὰ μῆνας ὀλίγας, these fathers made a fourth confession of faith, and they sent it to *Gallia* by *Nar-*

cissus of *Cilicia*, *Theodorus* of *Thrace*, *Maris* of *Calcedon*, and *Marcus* of *Syria*, and laid it before *Constans*. The form itself is extant in *Athanasius de Symbolis*. But neither doth this, more than any of the preceding ones, say any thing more, than to explain what was to be believed concerning the Holy Ghost: not a word is mentioned concerning the *communion of saints*, the *forgiveness of sins*, the *resurrection of the body*, or the *life everlasting*.

The *first* Council of *Antioch* was held, as was before observed, A.D. 341, and then they sent to *Constans* the Creed just now mentioned. Three years afterwards they met again, and made a new Creed, and sent *Eudoxius*, *Martyrius*, and *Macedonius* of *Cilicia*, and several others, into *Italy*, carrying with them a long Creed, which, from the length of it was called *μακροστικὸς*, vide *Socrat.*, l. i., c. 19; *Sozom.*, l. iii., c. 11. *Athan de Synod.* But notwithstanding its length, and its being sent to *Italy*, no objection was made to it as to any *deficiency*, though there was not a word in it relating to the *resurrection of the flesh*. *Socrates* tells us, that this Creed was not received by the *Western* bishops, *because it was wrote in Greek, a language they were ignorant of*. But the truth was, they thought that what was settled at *Nice* was enough; that though the fathers at *Antioch* seemed plain enough to strike at the notions of *Arius*, yet the *Western* bishops found that they

avoided the use of the term, *Consubstantial*. But as they rejected this Creed, and contended that no more than the *Nicene* should be admitted, I gather that at *this time* the *Western* bishops had more in their Creeds than the *Eastern* had; and consequently all that follows *the Holy Ghost* in the Apostles' Creed was added even after A.D. 344, when this long Creed was first sent into *Italy*.

We come now to the council held at *Sardica*, a city of *Illyrium*; a council designed by the two Emperors, *Constans* and *Constantius* to be œcumenical; and therefore the bishops of both the east and west were called to meet at it. It consisted chiefly of the *western* bishops, the eastern bishops soon retiring from it. It was held, *Ruffinus* and *Eusebius* being consuls, in the eleventh year after *Constantine's* death, *i. e.*, A.D. 347. *Socrates* tells us, that about *three hundred* of the *western* bishops met there, and from the *east* about *seventy-six*: and for this he quotes *Athanasius* and *Sabinus*, l. ii., c. 20. *Sozomen* makes the same numbers meet, *E. H.*, lib. iii., c. 12. *Athanasius* himself, in his second Apology, says there were, two hundred and eighty-four, p. 768. But be they more, or fewer, as soon as they met, the *eastern* bishops refused to come into company with the *western*, unless they would expel *Athanasius*, and *Paul* of *Constantinople*, from their assembly. When this was warmly opposed by the famous *Hosius* of *Corduba*, and *Protogenes* of *Sardica*, the

eastern bishops left the council and withdrew to *Philippopolis*, a city of *Thrace*, and there held a council by themselves. *Socrat.*, l. ii., c. 20. The western bishops first deprived the accusers of *Athanasius* of their honours, says *Socrates*, *ibid.* And then the *eastern* excommunicated Pope *Julius*, because he had communicated with *Athanasius*. Then they did the same to *Hosius*, and some others. We have nothing remaining of this council held at *Philippopolis* besides a form of faith drawn up by them, and a circular letter they sent to the bishops, priests, and deacons of the whole Church. As to the Creed they drew up, they profess a belief in one God—and in one Lord Jesus Christ—who—rose from the dead, and was taken up into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father, will come again to judge the quick and the dead, to give to every one according to his works, whose kingdom continues without ceasing through immense ages; for He sits at the right hand of the Father not only in this age, but in that which is to come. We believe also in the Holy Ghost, that is, the Paraclet, whom He promised to His apostles after His return to heaven, and sent to teach them, and to call to remembrance all things, by whom the souls of them that sincerely believe in Him are sanctified. They add according to the customs of the times, certain anathemas against such as they condemned. But not a word is there in their Creed concerning *the resurrection of the flesh*.

When I say this, I should observe that this Creed is cited three different ways. In the one there is nothing added, after what is said about their belief in the *Holy Ghost*, except the usual anathemas. And thus *Baronius* cites it, and *Binius*. And thus it is cited by *Labbe* in his account of this Council, p. 699. A second form is made use of by *Hilary*, who alone has preserved this Creed; and in him there is this addition, "Credimus in Sanctam Ecclesiam, in remissionem peccatorum, in vitam eternam:" *We believe in the holy Church, the forgiveness of sins, and in life everlasting*. And, thirdly, among the fragments of *Hilary*, there is a synodal epistle of this Sardican council of the eastern bishops, wrote to all the bishops in the world, wherein they send the form of the Creed to which they subscribed; in which they say, "Credimus et in Sanctam Ecclesiam, in remissionem, or remissionem peccatorum, in carnis resurrectionem, in vitam eternam." *We believe in the holy Church, in the forgiveness of Sins, in the resurrection of the flesh, in life everlasting*.

Now this last form, which contains the article of the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, could not be the genuine form to which these eastern bishops subscribed: for *Hilary*, who has given us the Creed itself, has omitted the article of the *Resurrection*. 2. As this is the first time it is mentioned by any eastern council, and is not mentioned by any subsequent eastern council for many years, it seems

to be an interpolation taken from the *western* Creeds, in, or after, the days of *Hilary*. 3. The Council of Antioch, held but six years before this at *Sardica*, hesitated much about admitting this article into their Creed. And probably they were now beginning to add this article about the *resurrection of the flesh*, as they did the articles of the *Church*, and of *forgiveness of sins*, and *life everlasting*.

But whether this clause was in the Creed of this *Sardican* meeting of the bishops, or not, it is certain that, after this time, when the council at *Sirmium* was held, it was not put into any of their Creeds. I enter not into the disputes of learned men, which of the Creeds I am going to mention was the *first*, or *second*, or *third*: i.e. Whether the Creeds extant, or which of them, was drawn up A.D. 351, or 357, or 359. *Socrates* tells us, that there was one which *Marcus Arethusius* drew up in *Greek*, and that there were two others wrote in *Latin*, “*σύμφωνον οὐκ ἔχσας ἔτε τὴν λέξιν, ἔτε τὴν σύνθεσιν, ἔτε πρὸς εἰντὰς, ἔτε μὲν πρὸς τὴν ἑλληνικὴν,*” which did not agree with that of *Arethusius*’s, neither in diction, nor composition, nor with one another, nor with the *Greek* one. *Soc.* lib. ii. c. 30. *Sozom.* lib. iv. c. 6. *Valesius* contends, that the *three Sirmian* Creeds were published by three different assemblies: and it is very likely they were so. And it is probable that *Arethusius*’s was the last of the three, in A.D. 359. It

is no great matter which of the three is first or last, as to the present enquiry, since in none of them is there a Word about the *resurrection of the flesh*.

The Creed which *Marcus Arethusius* drew up, as *Socrates* tells us, ended with the belief of the *Holy Ghost*, i.e. the *Paraclet*, whom the Lord having promised to His disciples, sent after His ascent into heaven, that He might teach them, and bring to their remembrance all things, through whom the souls of them that sincerely believe in Him are sanctified. Just in the words of the council of *Sardica* before cited.

The second Creed, published at *Sirmium*, and which the famous *Hosius* subscribed A.D. 357, was wrote in *Latin*. The historians tell us that *Hosius* was compelled by necessity to consent, and subscribe to it, the old man being beat, and otherwise used with cruelty, to force him to sign—they imagining that his name might be of great use to bring their Creed into credit. This form is almost all taken up in explaining what ought to be believed concerning the generation of the Son; and it ends with a belief of the *Holy Ghost*, who being sent by the Son, came according to the promise, that He might sanctify, and make manifest the apostles and all believers. *Socrat.* l. 2, c. 30.

The third Creed too, probably the first in point of time, mentions Christ's sitting at the right hand of the Father, and coming in the glory of the

Father, that He might give to every one according to his works. And in the Holy Ghost, whom the same only-begotten Son of God promised that He would send to mankind, the Paraclet, as it is written, I go to my Father, and will ask the Father, and He will send another Comforter to you, the Spirit of Truth, etc. Socrat. lib. ii., c. 37. This third form was drawn up at Sirmium, by Ursacius and Valens, but kept private till another time might happen more favourable; and was first published at Ariminum, A.D. 359.

But before I pass to this, I must take notice of a spurious letter of *Athanasius* and the *Egyptian bishops* to Pope *Liberius*, and *Liberius's* answer to them.

The letter of *Athanasius* recites the *Nicene Creed*, and has nothing added after the words—*And in the Holy Spirit. Liberius* answers, *Fidem Nicæni Concilii in eadam Epistola rectam reperimus*—"We find the faith of the Nicene Council to be right," and adds "*Aliam Fidem nulli licere proferre, aut conscribere vel componere, that it was not lawful for any man to produce, or write, or compose any other Creed, and if any one presumed to teach or deliver any other Creed, if they were bishops or clergymen, they were to be deprived; if laymen, to be anathematized.*"

This answer, directed to "*Athanasius and the Egyptian bishops, who thought rightly concerning the belief of the Trinity,*" is dated the 8th of

the Calends of June, Asclepius and Deodatus being consuls. Now as there are no such consuls in the *Fasti*, Binius justly thinks both the letter of *Athanasius*, and that of *Liberius* to him, of suspected credit. Nor can he assign a time for the writing of them, whether it was in *Julian's* or *Valen's* reign. However, about these times we may place another letter of *Liberius* to *Athanasius*, wherein he shews that *that God the Word took upon Him perfect man*, but in it he mentions nothing about a resurrection. *Athanasius*, in his answer to *Liberius*, speaks of the flesh of *Christ*, as mortal, *He not being mortal*; as visible, *He not being visible*; and when he had spoken of the Trinity, he adds, "οὕτως καὶ σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν πιστεύομεν, τουτέστι τῷ σώματος ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς ἁγίας γραφὰς τῷ φθαρτῷ καὶ θνητῷ αὐτῷ μεταβαλλομένου εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ ἀθανασίαν ὑπὸ τῷ θεῷ." Likewise we believe the resurrection of the flesh, *e. i.*, of our body according to the Holy Scriptures; his corruptible and mortal being changed into immortality and incorruption by God. *Athanas.*, p. 244. *Liberius* takes no notice of the article of the resurrection of the flesh. *Athanasius* does it by way of inference. We believe the resurrection of the flesh, *i. e.*, of our bodies, *HIS, αὐτῷ, corruptible and mortal being changed by God into incorruption and immortality*. In the councils both by *Binius* and *Labbe*, it is said, "Ita, quoque carnis resurrectionem credimus, hoc est, corpus nostrum secundum Sacras

“Scripturas ex corruptibili mortalique in incorruptibilitatem et in immortalitatem a Deo mutandum esse.” But in *Athanasius's* own letter it is, That *Christ's body* not *our bodies*, shall be changed by God from corruptible to incorruptible, *vide Bini Concil.*, vol. i., p. 588; *Labbei Concil.*, vol. ii., p. 768. This was about the year of our Lord 357. But this letter of *Liberius*, and the answer of *Athanasius*, are justly suspected of being forged.

Differences still continuing between the *Orthodox*, as they were called, and the *Arians*; and the lesser synods at *Sardica*, and *Sirmium*, not putting an end to the disputes among the clergy, as the Emperor *Constantius* desired, he resolved to call an Oecumenical Synod; and to divide it in two parts; that the eastern bishops should meet at *Seleucia* in *Isauria*, the western bishops at *Ariminum* in *Italy*. This assembly was held A.D. 359, *Eusebius* and *Hypatius* being consuls. At *Ariminum* or *Rimini*, met no less than four hundred bishops from *Illyricum*, *Italy*, *Africa*, *Spain*, *Gaul*, etc., and they were maintained at the Emperor's expense. Here, the same Creed that was read at *Sirmium* before the Emperor, was recited on the 11th of the Calends of *June*. When they come to that part of the Creed, where they mention Christ, they say, they believe—“that He will “come at the last day of the resurrection in the “glory of the Father, that He may give to every

“one according to his works. And in the Holy Spirit, whom the Only-begotten promised that He would send to mankind, the Paraclet, as it is written, *I go to my Father, and will ask Him, and He will send another Comforter to you, the Spirit of Truth; He shall receive of mine, and teach you, and put you in mind of all things.*” Here their Creed ends, and nothing is said about the Church, or the *resurrection of the flesh*, or the *forgiveness of sins*: nor when *Athanasius* wrote his remarks upon this *formula* of faith, did he make any objection to their omission of this, or other articles, as *Socrates* observes, lib. ii., c. 37, but only to their omission of the word, *consubstantial*.

As this was what passed at *Ariminum*, the eastern bishops met at *Seleucia*; and were about one hundred and sixty in number, as *Socrates* and *Athanasius* say. Others, as *Theodoret*, say one hundred and fifty only, lib. ii., c. 27. In this synod there were great differences, some accusing others, some adhering to *Acasius*, others rejecting him: and when they came to the affair of a Creed, many of the bishops were for the *Nicene* Creed, and for no other; others were for that of *Antioch*. There being so little agreement here, and the council being divided into two parties, one of them subscribed the Creed of *Antioch*. But this done, *the doors being fastened*, the next day *Acacius* objected to what had been done, as it were *in secret*, and then he read a form of Creed, in which he

likewise took no more notice of the resurrection of the *flesh* or *body* than what is contained in those words, that *Christ would come in glory to judge the quick and dead*, Socrat., lib. ii., c. 40.

This council being dismissed, and that at *Ariminum* still sitting, there was held at *Constantinople* a synod of fifty bishops, who affirmed the Creed of *Ariminum*, adding only some things to it, but still there is not a tittle relative to the article of the *resurrection of the flesh*.

Had there at this time been any such article in the *western Church*, could it possibly not have been inserted into the Creed of *Ariminum*? Could so many bishops from *Italy, Gaul, Britain, Spain*, meet, and not take notice of such an article, had it been in their *Baptismal Creed*? It is true, that their great point was, to fix a true notion of the *person* and *quality* of the Son of God: but had they had any farther articles in their Creeds, they would have been mentioned, as in fact we meet with them recited wherever they were inserted.

The next symbol of faith I met with, is in *Epiphanius's Anchorate*, wrote, as appears by the marks of the year which he has set down, A.D. 374. In this he recites a Creed very like to that which was seven years after established at *Constantinople*; and which is known by the name of the *Constantinopolitan Creed*. It should seem as if *Epiphanius* was the author of this, and the Council of *Constantinople* approved of it, and established it,

with very little alteration, when they met together seven years after. *Epiphanius* observes, that *Ἡμεῖς καὶ πᾶσα ἡ ἁγία Καθολικὴ Εκκλησία, πρὸς τὰς ἀνακυφάσας αἵρέσεις ἀκολουθῶς τῇ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκεινων πατέρων προτεταγμένη πίστει, οὕτως λέγομεν, μάλιστα τοῖς τῷ ἁγίῳ λουτρῷ προσιῦσιν, ἵνα ἀπαγγέλλωσι καὶ λέγωσιν οὕτως.* “*We, and all orthodox bishops, and all the holy Catholic Church, say thus against the rising heresies, agreeably to the faith before ordained of those holy fathers,*” he means the Nicene fathers, especially to those who come to the sacred font, “that they may profess and say thus.” Here he recites a Creed in these words—*We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, of all things both visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all ages, that is of the substance of the Father, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both which are in heaven, and which are in earth, who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was made man, was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried, and rose again the third day according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and shall come again with glory to judge the quick*

and dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets. In one Holy Catholic Church. *We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins, we look for the resurrection of the dead, and life in the world to come. Amen.* He then proceeds to give us a larger Creed, wherein he paraphrases this shorter; and when he comes to speak of the *resurrection of the dead*, he adds, *καὶ κρίσιν δικαίαν ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων*, “*we look for a just judgment of souls and bodies.*” And here we first meet with an anathema on those *who did not profess the resurrection of the dead*, ἀναθεματίζομεν τὰς μὴ ὁμολογούντας ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν.

But though *Epiphanius* thus explains his notions, and anathematizes those who did not *profess the resurrection of the dead*, yet when the General Council at *Constantinople* met a few years after, A.D. 381, *Syagrius* and *Eucherius* being consuls, we find they did not put into their Creed (whatever opinion they might have) *the resurrection of the flesh, or body*, but kept to the Scripture language, *the resurrection of the dead*: and so it has continued ever since in the East.

Let us now stop a little, and review what has been said.

First, we have not met with any *public* Creed,

before this of *Constantinople*, and this so late as A.D. 381, where there has been placed an article of even the *resurrection of the dead*. Nor is there any *private* Creed, except one of *Arius*, and that just before mentioned of *Epiphanius*, that contains even such article.

Secondly, Here we find several additional articles which no *public* Creed before this contained, viz., *One Holy Catholic Church; one baptism for the remission of sins, the resurrection of the dead; and life in the world to come.*

Thirdly, Whatever private notions prevailed among Christians, yet we meet with no Creeds drawn up by any body, on any occasion, wherein the *resurrection of the body or flesh* is made an article, before that of *Arius* and *Euzoius*, some time after the Council of *Nice*. We have one drawn by *Eusebius*, which was read in the presence of *Constantine*, containing what he says he received from his predecessors, and what he was instructed in, when he received the first rudiments of Christianity. Upon the profession of this Creed he tells us that he was *baptized*; and it contained what he believed, and what he taught when he was a *presbyter*, and when he was a *bishop*. And in this there was no such article. We have too the Creed of *Lucian* the martyr, which the fathers of the Synod at *Antioch* affirmed to be wrote in his own hand, and which was there produced and read. *Sozom.*, E. H.,

lib. iii., 5. Here too we find nothing about the resurrection of the *body* or *flesh*.

Fourthly, Though none of the creeds hitherto mentioned, except that of *Arius* and *Euzoius* contained in express words the resurrection of the *body* or *flesh*; or even of the *dead*, except that of *Epiphanius*, yet all believed even from the beginning, and they all declared their belief of *the resurrection* of the *dead*, by asserting that Christ *shall come again to judge both the quick and the dead, and shall give to every man according to his works*. Whilst all professed this faith, it necessarily followed that all should be *raised from the dead*: and therefore there was no *deficiency* in their Creeds, though there was no such article expressed in terms in them.

Fifthly, *Arius*, as I have observed, *first* mentioned in this Creed *the resurrection* of the *flesh*. This he did when he presented his creed to *Constantine*, in order to get himself restored to the Church, in or about the year 327. It was after *Constantia's* death, who was sister to *Constantine*, and wife of *Licinius*. The next time we have any hint of this, as an article proper for a Creed, is A.D. 341, in the Council of *Antioch*. And at this time it is mentioned in a very extraordinary manner, as is already observed,—*If anything ought to be added, we believe the resurrection of the flesh*. These fathers had been particularly cautious not to be deemed followers of *Arius*, and they thought

it wrong to add to the usual Creed any such article as *Arius* and *Euzoius* had done: and though they conceived such addition *might* be made, yet they would not venture to have any such addition in any of their Creeds there drawn up.

Sixthly, I have taken notice that in the Second Century, especially towards the middle and latter end of it, the notion prevailed amongst many, that there was to be a resurrection of the *body* or *flesh*. *Athanasius* afterwards espoused this notion; and now I must add that *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, in his Catechetical Lectures, (read as *Dr. Cave* supposes, A.D. 347,) recites the latter part of his Creed, as if it were in this form,—“We believe one baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; and in one Catholic Church; in the resurrection of the flesh; and in life everlasting.” *Cyril*, p. 220. And he makes *body* and *flesh* to be the same thing, as others had done when they wrote on this subject. The article then of the resurrection of the flesh was in *Cyril’s* Creed in the year 347. But yet it did not prevail in the Eastern Church for thirty-four years after this. For when the Council of *Constantinople* was held, they established only the resurrection of the dead, though they took into their Creed the three other articles, which *Cyril* expounded.

Let us now pass from the East to the West. It was no where said, that I remember, at what time this article of the resurrection of the flesh,

was first inserted into the *Apostle's Creed*. For the story of its being made by the twelve apostles, each of them contributing an article, as *Ruffinus* says, is now rejected by all as a mere fable. He tells us, that "in diversis Ecclesiis aliqua in his "verbis inveniuntur adjecta," i. e., *In divers Churches some things are found to be added to these words* of the Creed. But then he adds, "In Ecclesia tamen Urbis Romæ hoc non deprehenditur factum;" *In the Church of the City of Rome this is not found to be done*. Could we then know what the Creed of the Church of the City of *Rome* was, we might possibly see the original *baptismal* Creed of that place. But the mischief is, that in all other places, "quantum intelligi datur, propter nonnullos hæreticos addita quædam videntur," as far as *Ruffinus* "could possibly find out, some things seem to be added on account of some heretics or other," by which means the sense of novel doctrines were thought to be guarded against. Unless therefore he had given us the *Roman* Creed in particular, and had compared with that some other Creed, marking the agreements and disagreements with it, we cannot be certain what that was in its purity. *Ruffinus* has wrote a Comment on the Creed of the Church of *Aquileia*; and that contained several additions to that of *Rome*. E.g. The Creed of *Aquileia* did not contain the article of Christ's *descent into hell*: the *Roman* did. The *Aquileian* Creed expresses

the article of the resurrection of the *flesh* by the addition of the pronoun *THIS*,—*The resurrection of THIS flesh*. Neither the *Roman*, nor any other Creed in the world has the word *THIS*. It is not certain that the *Roman* Creed had the last article—*life everlasting*; the *Aquileian* Creed had it not. Now *Ruffinus* flourished after the Council of *Constantinople*, suppose about 390 or later. If therefore this article was *now* inserted into the *Western* Creeds, it is not much to be wondered at, since all believe the resurrection of the dead, and many had got into the notion of a resurrection of the flesh, however different it is from the article in the original, which alone is the article to be believed.

Ruffinus asserts that the error of *Valentinus* and the *Manichæans*, and the *objections* of the *heathens*, were the reasons of the insertion of the article of the *resurrection* of the *flesh*. “Nam “*Valentinus resurrectionem carnis omni modo “negat; et Manichæi.*” And when he had cited some passages of Scripture in confutation of them, he goes on, “*Sed infideles clamant et dicunt, etc.*” *How can flesh which is putrified and turned into dust, or is dispersed by the waves of the sea be re-collected?* etc. Whether it be right to enlarge Creeds, in order to put a stop to errors, I presume not to judge; but if it was inserted on account of the common objections of *Valentinus* and the *Manichæans*, it was not inserted till after *Mane’s* time, *i. e.*, not before the year 300 at

soonest. But then it is certain it was not inserted at the time of the Council of *Ariminum*, as was proved above; therefore it was inserted in the *Roman Creed* after A.D. 359.

There is a creed which hitherto I have taken no notice of, though there have been some men who are ready to pay as much deference to it as to any part of the Sacred Writings; I mean the Creed that occurs in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, a book so senseless, that no evidence can prove it to be the effect of inspiration. The pronouncement of this Creed at baptism is so minutely set down, and every circumstance of *renouncing the devil* is so described, that nothing can be more exact and formal. They profess a faith "with *πάσι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν ἑρανῶν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*, *Apost. Constitut.*, lib. vii., c. 41, i. e., *with all believers in the Holy Catholic Church, in the resurrection of the flesh, and in the remission of sins, and in the kingdom of heaven, and in the life of the world to come.*" If one looks back to *Arius* and *Euzoius's Creed*, we shall find these very articles ranged indeed in a little different order, but exactly the same. *Their Creed* was, *We believe in the resurrection of the flesh, and life in the world to come, and in the kingdom of heaven, and in the one Catholic Church of God, from one end of the world to the other.* This in the *Consti-*

tutions contains just the same articles, though placed somewhat differently. This Creed therefore is formed upon the plan of *Arius* and *Euzoius's* Creed, and consequently is posterior to that, and probably was drawn up about, or rather before, the middle of the *Fourth Century*, when this article began to have its advocates, and was placed by some in the public Creeds.

And now, one cannot help observing, that among all the numerous Creeds here produced, there is not one in any part of the world, earlier than the *Fourth Century*, in which the *resurrection* of the *flesh* is mentioned at all. It was before that time indeed the subject of controversy; and learned men debated the question, some professing their private opinion that the very bodies they bore about them were to be raised; that the bodies that sinned were to suffer. So did *Irenæus* in *France*; and so did *Tertullian*, and not very long after, so did *Cyprian* in *Africa*; and *Athenagoras*, and *Theophilus* wrote professedly to vindicate this doctrine. In the East, the first time it is at all mentioned is in a Creed of *Arius* and *Euzoius*, delivered to the Emperor *Constantine* the Great, not long after the Council of *Nice*: and thence it is in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. When it is first mentioned by any council is A.D. 341; and there it is mentioned in such a manner, as evidently proves it not to have been in any Creed whatever in those parts of the world. Six years after we

meet with it in *Cyril's Creed* at *Jerusalem*, A.D. 347, with the *additional articles* that *Arius* put into his Creed. But still the Councils of *Sardica* and *Sirmium*, and *Ariminum*, did not insert any such article; nor did the Council of *Constantinople* go into any particular *modus* of the resurrection, but speaks as the Scriptures do, saying, *We look for the resurrection of the dead*, A.D. 381.

2. The spurious Creed forged by somebody under the name of *Athanasius*, and is commonly called the *Athanasian Creed*, has this article: but then it is on all hands agreed, that this forgery was not at soonest before the *fifth century*.

3. One may easily conceive to what lengths this article was carried, when in the Creed of the *Aquileian Church*, it was expressed I believe, "*Resurrectionem HUIUS carnis*," the *resurrection of THIS flesh*: contrary not only to the doctrine of Scripture, but to all other Creeds that ever were formed in the whole world.

4. As the *Roman Creed* is the shortest Creed of all others, and has omitted several things that are in the *Aquileian Creed*, this ended with the *resurrection of the flesh*; and the oldest copy we know of this Creed, even so late as A.D. 708, had not what it now concludes with *life everlasting*, Vid. *Usser de Symbolis*. But the article of the resurrection of the flesh was not in it when the council sat at *Ariminum*.

Lastly, it is well known, that that great and

honest man *Synesius*, thought that he saw so much absurdity in the commonly received notion of the *resurrection*, that he resolved never to submit to be ordained a bishop, rather than to pretend to believe an article which he could not believe. It was by his time, *i. e.*, about the year 420, got to be so general an article of faith, that very few, if any, had any hesitation about it. It was become almost an universal notion ; *α καθωμιλημένη ἀνασ-στασις*, *a commonly preached resurrection*, a doctrine every where taught : but what he could not profess nor pretend to believe ; nor would he come into what he thought a groundless hypothesis of the multitude.

From the account before given of the rise and growth of this notion of the *resurrection of the flesh*, it seems to follow clearly, that in all points which depend upon Revelation, men should confine themselves rigidly to the Scripture language, and not to be wise above what is written. When men recede from that, and add *human* doctrines to *divine* ones, they always involve themselves in difficulties unsurmountable. If the curiosity of idle or vain people, had not led them to a particular explication of the general article of the resurrection of the *dead*, how many disputes had been avoided ? If one looks into the history of this doctrine, one cannot but see, that though our baptismal Creed is now determinate for a belief of *the resurrection of the body or flesh*, yet three hundred and fifty years

passed before there was any such notion required to be professed in the Christian Church : and so long as all are taught to believe, that *all are to be judged, quick and dead ; that all are to stand at the judgment seat of Christ*, and that he will come again, and render to every one according to his works, is it not raising an idle question to ask, *With what bodies shall we come ?* And if any one answers such a question, by saying—in *this flesh*—does he not assert *more* than Revelation has taught him, though it is what nothing but Revelation can assure him of ? And should the consequence be, what actually has been, that unbelievers raise an objection from hence against Christianity itself, *believers* are answerable for it, *as teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*.

The growth of infidelity has long been the subject of great complaint amongst serious well-meaning people : may it not be worth considering, whether the true cause of infidelity does not lie amongst those who profess a faith which they call Christian, and which is found inconsistent with reason, and even common sense ? Every one that examines at all, will see additions made to the great articles of Christianity. How many *additions* were made to what the Gospel of Christ has said concerning the Son and the Holy Ghost, in the several Creeds framed in the fourth century ? This possibly was then done with a good design to fence in, and to secure a right faith : but whatever was

the design, it has been attended with consequences fatal to Christianity itself. The *fences* have been considered as the *thing fenced in*; and when men have seen things that they cannot comprehend or understand, taught as fundamentals of *Christianity*, it is natural to reject what is unintelligible as impossible to be required by God: and thus must *infidelity* prevail. Whereas if one takes the religion of Christ as it lies in the Word of God, it is *pure, peaceable*, no ways contrary to reason, *intelligible* by every body, so far as every body is concerned. The evidence for its truth is clear, and plain, and easy. *The poor had the Gospel preached unto them* at first, as well as the rich; and the poor are to be saved as well as the rich, and therefore the one can *understand* what is required of him by Christ as well as the other. But then if men will presume to take the Word of God into their hands, and will new mould and frame it as they think fit; and will make what is easy to be hard and unintelligible, and then will anathematize and persecute men for refusing to profess what they do not understand, there will always be infidelity covered under the mask of Christianity; and Christianity, or what is called so, will be slyly or openly attacked; and till it is professed pure and uncorrupted, it must have its enemies; and if *offences* arise, *woe unto him by whom the offence cometh*.

A LETTER
TO THE
EDITOR OF DR. SYKES' PAMPHLET,
BY THE
REV. DR. BAYLEY,
OF ARGYLE SQUARE, KING'S CROSS, LONDON.

THE argument of Dr. Sykes for the non-existence in the Primitive Creed of the clause on the Resurrection of the Body is extremely interesting and satisfactory, and ought to convince every Christian that, whether the material body will ever rise or not, is at least a perfectly open question, which he may freely examine and determine upon, as guided by truthful evidence. The early Christians, too, knew well that the soul was a spiritual body. They fully recognized the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* (spiritual body) of which St. Paul speaks (1 Cor. xv. 44), and they could well believe in the resurrection of the body, while they at the same time confessed with the apostle again, that "the body thou sowest is *not* the body that shall be" (ver. 37), *καὶ ὁ σπέρμεις, οὐ τὸ σῶμα τὸ γενεσόμενον*. Even the heathen philosophers and poets

attributed bodies to men after death, as is evident from Socrates in his dying speech; from Cicero, and from Virgil, all of whom represented the departed as still existing in bodily forms, and still retaining their identities. When the sentence, "I believe in the resurrection of the body," was introduced, it would not necessarily attract much attention; for the spiritual would think of a spiritual body and definite characteristics. But when the interest of Christians in spiritual things became less, and their conceptions of the spiritual world became more and more indistinct, until it became none, the spiritual body having been forgotten, the phrase, "the resurrection of the body," would only suggest to the mind the idea of the rising again of dead natural bodies. The time, however, has now come, when the knowledge of the eternal world is dawning upon mankind afresh; while, on the other hand, the facts of physiology are making the absurdity of the resurrection of the material body more and more manifest. - Hence both are preparing the way for a return to the truly Christian and original idea, now cleared, established, and confirmed anew, that we rise at death in our spiritual bodies into a more perfect world. We are coming once more to the conviction expressed by the apostle: "I know that if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, I have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

The enquiry, however, of Dr. Sykes suggests

another and a parallel one—When and how came the resurrection of the natural body to be adopted by the Jews? For it was no part of the ancient belief. There is not the slightest trace of it in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, or Deuteronomy; and these bring us to the time when the Jewish religion was completely established. We read of angels it is true, and of the patriarchs going to their people, being gathered to their fathers (Gen. xxv. 8; xxxv. 29); but angels are represented as men, and called men, and not the least hint is given of their being of a different race. This same absence of any allusion to the rising again of dead bodies continues through the whole period comprised in the Book of Joshua, the Books of Samuel, and the Kings; that is to say, for more than a thousand years of their history. Let any one contemplate this fact, and ask himself if it is at all probable or possible that the resurrection of the body could be believed by the Jewish sages or people, and never once be stated or even alluded to during the first and the best ten centuries of their national existence. Of course, I may be reminded of the Book of Job, and of its one passage (xix. 25—27) which has been so grievously mistranslated. But, to say nothing of the fact of the Book of Job not being a Jewish composition at all—for Job was an inhabitant of the land of Uz, and of a time so early that he makes no allusion to Abraham, Moses, or

the Law—*no scholar* now maintains that the translation of this passage in our English Version of the Bible is a correct one. There is nothing about worms or body in any other version whatever than ours, and it is difficult to see how the translators could go so far wrong. The passage itself is not difficult:—

וְאֵלֶּי דִּעְמִי אֵלֵּי דֵּי וְאֶדְרִי
עַל-עֲשֵׂר יָקִים : וְאֶדְרִי עוֹדִי נִקְשׁוּ וְאֵת בִּמְשָׁלִי אֶתְּחַד אֵלֹהִים
אֲשֶׁר אֵלֵּי אֶתְּחַדְלִי וְעַדִּי כִּי אֵלֵּי וְלֹא וְרַ בְּלִי כְלִי' בְּרַחֲמֵי

and, strictly rendered, runs thus,—“I know that my Redeemer liveth, and he shall at last stand upon the dust. And after my skin, destroy this, yet, from my flesh shall I see God : whom I shall see for myself, and not a stranger. My inward parts are consumed in my bosom.”

Here there is no allusion to persons dying and being buried, and then rising from the grave, where worms have been feeding upon them. The idea simply is, that to whatever extremity he should be reduced, God would appear and vindicate him, while he was yet in the flesh ; that is, before his death. This confidence of Job, that he would in person, and with his own eyes, see his Deliverer, and not leave his vindication to be seen only by strangers, is the very pith of the patriarch's hope ; and he did not trust in vain. God appeared for his deliverance, shewed that He does all things well, and never suffers His servants to

be afflicted in vain. He appears at last for their complete triumph over all their sorrows, and out of their seeming evils brings real and lasting good. When this took place in the case of Job, the patriarch exclaimed, on beholding his hopes fully crowned, "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee." Job xlix. 5. Never were anticipation and fulfilment more completely united. Job's hopes are realized, the divine ways are justified, and a lesson of the very highest importance is revealed. Thus a stumbling block is removed out of the way by this rectification of our common version of this passage. For, undoubtedly, the doctrine of the Book of Job in other places is, that the material body once put off will not be resumed, and the soul, having once gone into the everlasting state, will not return. The first of these statements is clearly given chap. vii. 9: "As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away, so he that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more;" while the second is given in equally positive terms: "Are not my days few? Cease, then, and let me alone, that I may take comfort a little before I go whence I SHALL NOT RETURN, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death." Chap. x. 20, 21. Again, "When a few years are come, then I shall go the way whence I SHALL NOT RETURN." Chap. xvi. 22.

A similar feeling and conviction were uttered by David when his child was taken from him: "Now

he is dead, wherefore should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me." 2 Sam. xii. 23.

Neither here nor elsewhere, neither in history, prophecy, nor psalm, do we find any allusion to the idea of dead bodies being expected to rise, up to the time of Isajah's prophecy; that is, from the time of Abraham, for more than a thousand years, including the period when the Law was given, and thence, up to and beyond the time when the Jewish dispensation had its fullest development and glory under Solomon.

Let us just endeavour to realize and review our position. We sometimes fail to see many truths in their proper native character, from the circumstance of our having received the Bible as one volume, and being accustomed to regard it from childhood as a gift from God in this entire and single state. This has been the case with the doctrine now under review. We have been early led to believe that it was taught and implied by certain expressions of our Lord and His apostles, where what was intended to be spiritual has been construed naturally; and besides we have unconsciously regarded the whole Bible as one volume given entire from God as the authorized teacher of all religious truth. What we suppose, therefore, to be taught in any portion of the Divine volume, we regard as being taught in the whole, and always taught there. But let us now examine

our position. We have ascertained that not a word of the resurrection of dead bodies, or any, even the remotest, allusion to such an amazing fact is to be found in God's dealings with the Jewish people, up to the period when their best days were passed, and decline and ruin lay before them. Can we suppose that God would not only let former dispensations pass away, without a revelation of this doctrine, but that not an intimation should be given of it, nor should it even be heard of, during any time embraced in the history of the Jews, until they were amongst the Chaldeans, and had begun to imbibe the superstitions of the heathen? As soon as the fall took place, redemption was announced (Gen. iii. 15), as the divine means of restoration; and if the outward body were to rise again we might surely have expected that such an assurance would have been given when the first death occurred. But to admit that this doctrine is a truth, and yet that it was not revealed for thousands of years, and during several dispensations, does seem to me inconceivable. Many, very many, of those leading minds among the Jews who are rising above the additions of Talmudist tradition, and admitting only the divine authority of Moses and the Prophets, have rejected the notion of dead bodies rising again as having no ground in revelation. Being sometime ago in conversation with a leading Rabbi at Prague, I asked what was the prevailing idea now among liberal-

minded Jews, as to the resurrection of the earthly body. "Oh," he said, "we don't believe a word of it. It never originated in Judaism. It was a corruption introduced from without." He added, "We believe that man continues to exist as a real man after death, but we totally discard the idea of dead bodies rising again." Our argument, is, then, that down to the time of the exile to Babylon, there is no trace of any revelation to the Jews, or any belief amongst them of the resurrection of dead bodies. After their return from captivity, we discover amongst them traces of that doctrine, as well as many other dark and heathenish superstitions. But, what is very peculiar and important in our enquiry, is, further, that no heathen system taught the doctrine of the resurrection of the body again, save one; but that one was the very one which prevailed in Babylonia. The system of Zoroaster, taught to the Parsees, probably about the time of Moses, did contain the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and the purification of the world by fire. See *Boun-Dehesch*, sect. xxxi.; *Zend-Avesta*, by Anquetil du Perron, vol. ii. In this supposed revelation of Ormuzd to Zoroaster, it is particularly taught that the bodies of men, however they may be scattered over the world, would rise again, by a process which would take fifty-seven years for its full accomplishment;*

* "Mais on la verra certainement cette resurrection. Les veines seront de nouveau rendues au corps, et lorsque la resurrection aura

a river of fire would melt the mountains, and cause the metals to flow in a stream of fire over the earth and purify it.* The well-disposed, to whom it would be like warm milk, would pass through this stream, and be fully purified, both as to soul and body. They will then have some liquors given to them which will make them great and immortal. To perfect a full-grown man, he must drink it for forty years; one who has died in childhood may be perfected in fifteen.† The wicked will be punished for a season, called three days and nights, and then forgiven.

été faite, il ne faudra pas la faire une seconde fois. Car dans ce temps, de la terre celeste viendront les os, de l'eau le sang, des arbres le poil, du feu la vie, comme à la creation des êtres. Kaïo-morts ressuscitera le premier ensuite Meschia et Meschiané: et apres eux, les autres hommes. En cinquante-sept ans tous les morts ressusciteront, l'homme paroitra sur la terre. Pur ou Darvand (wicked) chaque homme ressuscitera de cette maniere: les ames seront d'abord, ensuite leur corps repandus dans le monde entier existant."—*Zend-Avesta*, vol. ii., p. 412.

* "Ensuite la chaleur du feu fera couler les grandes et les petits montagnes, qui renfermes les metaux. Ces metaux seront sur la terre comme un fleuve. Alors, tout homme passera dans ces metaux coulons, et sera purifiés. Les purs s'approcheront donc, et y passeront comme dans un lait chaud: les Darvands (wicked) seront obligés d'y marcher; ainsi dans le monde tout ira dans les metaux coulons, et de cette maniere tout homme deviendra excellent et heureux."—p. 414.

† "Sosiosch donnera de ses liqueurs à tous les hommes, et ils seront immortels et grands, tant que les etres dureront. Il est dis qu'on en donnera pendant quarante ans à l'homme fait, et il sera établi de nouveau: on en donnera pendant quinze ans à celui qui sera mort enfant."—p. 415.

Now here, from the sacred books of the Parsees themselves, it is manifest that the resurrection of the body, the purification of the world by fire, and other particulars which the Jews entertained after their return from captivity, and at the time when our Lord was in the world, were plainly taught in the religion of Zoroaster. The Jews had not these ideas before they were carried away captive among these people; they had them after they returned, when their own prophets were silent, and they were more and more making the Word of God of none effect by their traditions.

The conclusion seems to be irresistible, namely, that the doctrine of the resurrection of dead bodies had altogether a HEATHEN ORIGIN, and has not the SLIGHTEST DIVINE AUTHORITY.

This argument becomes yet more manifest when we remember that, when the Jews were carried away captive, not only was there no trace of the doctrine of a resurrection of matter being believed or known amongst them, but, with the single exception of the Parsees—the people among whom the Jews became captive—no other nation in the world held this doctrine. “The resurrection of the body was unknown to the Pagans,” says Rollin (vol. iv., p. 51). Yet he admits the exception in the case of the disciples of Zoroaster (vol. ii. 39). The Greeks and Romans retained amongst them the conviction handed down from earlier and purer times, of man living as a man after death, as beau-

tifully insisted upon by Socrates in his dying discourse, and frequently advocated by Cicero (see *Tusc. Quest.* i. 1, n. 71, 72), and *Somnium Scipionis*. Yet they never admitted of any resurrection of the body. The Hindoos and Chinese never had this doctrine, and ridicule it to the present day. The Egyptians in like manner, though they embalmed the bodies of their dead, partly out of respect, and partly as symbols, probably, of the preservation of the soul by the inward spices of heavenly virtues, yet never anticipated or desired any resurrection of the body. The custom of embalming has itself been by some regarded as a warrant for a doubt as to the Egyptian doctrine. "Why," it has been said, "should they have embalmed the bodies at all, unless they expected to have them again?" But, surely, with all the ancient monuments of Egypt which we now possess, with their liturgical service for the dead,* which has been brought to light; if they had expected a resurrection of the body, there would have been a hint of it in some painted or sculptured representation. Nothing of the kind exists. On the contrary, the passage of the soul *after it has left the body* is depicted in the "*Book of the Dead*," until it has become fully purified, and, in complete human form, enters the realms of light.

The idea, so widely spread among the ancients, that the body was the symbol of the soul, and that,

* See Bunsen, vol. I., p. 25.

as the body was treated in this world, the soul would be treated in the eternal world, is quite sufficient ground for the practice of embalming among the Egyptians, without seeking for another, of which their monuments give not the slightest intimation. "Every one, therefore," says Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, "whose virtuous life entitled him to admission into the regions of the blessed, was supposed to be again united to the Deity, of whom he was an emanation; and with the emblem of Thmei, purporting that he was judged or justified, he received the holy name of Osiris. His body was so bound up as to resemble the mysterious ruler of Amenti (the unseen world), it bore some of the emblems peculiar to him, and the beard, of a form which belonged exclusively to the gods, was given to the deceased, in token of his having assumed the character of that deity." —Wilkinson's *Egyptians*, second series, vol. ii., p. 382. The belief that the soul could not be admitted into Elysium if the body were not respectfully treated and buried, prevailed most extensively among the ancients. We find it in Homer; the soul of Patroclus appeared in a dream to Achilles, and entreats him to bury his body as quickly as possible.

“Θαπτε με οτι ταχιστα, πυλας περησω

Τηλε με ειρουσι ψυχαι, ειδωλα καμοντων

Ουδε με πως μισγεσθαι υπερ ποταμοιο εωσιν.”

The same sentiment inspired Horace to write

his fine ode (*Archytas*, book i., carmen 28), in which the philosopher prays the traveller to cover his remains, and threatens punishment to his posterity should he refuse.

“Negligis immeritis nocituram
Postmodo te natis fraudem committere? Fors et
Debita jura vicesque superbæ
Te maneant ipsum : precibus non linquar multis
Teque piacula nulla resolvent.
Quamquam festinas, non est mora longa, licebit
Injecto ter pulvere curras.”*

Virgil particularly alludes to the same feeling and belief, and describes those souls as wandering on the shores of Styx for one hundred years, whose bodies were unburied.

“Hæc omnis, quam cernis, inops inhumataque turba est :
Portitor ille, Charon : hi quos vehit unda, sepulti.
Nec ripas datur horrendas et rauca fluenta
Transportare prius, quam sedibus ossa quierunt.
Centum errant annos, volitantque hæc litora circum :
Tum demum admissi stagna exoptata revisunt.”†

Bearing in mind, then, these views of the an-

* “Thy guileless race this bold neglect shall mourn,
And thou shalt feel the just returns of scorn ;
My curses shall pursue the guilty deed,
And all, in vain, thy richest victims bleed.
Whate’er thy haste, oh ! let my prayer prevail ;
Thrice strew the land, then hoist the flying sail.”

† Book 6th.—“The ghosts rejected are th’ unhappy crew
Deprived of sepulchres and fun’ral due :

cients, so earnestly held, and so widely spread, combined with the symbolic character of the body especially recognized in Egypt, and the tender regard entertained for the remains of those loved ones who had gone before, of which there are many touching evidences in the Egyptian customs, on which account they often embalmed animals also; there is ample ground for the origin of the practice of embalming, without supposing another origin, of which the people themselves have left no indication or evidence.

Had the Egyptians held the doctrine, we should have heard of it either as received, or rejected and condemned, among the Israelites, who were two hundred and fifteen years in Egypt. We resume, then, our argument. The Jews, previous to the captivity, had no knowledge or belief of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. No other great system of religious teaching in the world had it, save one, and that one prevailed over the region where the Jews remained seventy years in captivity. From their return into their own land, to the coming of our Lord, we do indeed find traces of that doctrine amongst them, and at length a prevalent belief in it; still with no divine authority

The boatman Charon: those the buried host
He ferries over to the farther coast;
Nor dares his transport vessel cross the waves
With such whose bones are not composed in graves:
A hundred years they wander on the shore,
At length, their penance done, are wafted o'er."

for it. What then is the fair inference? Can it be any other than this? The doctrine itself is a Babylonish corruption, originating in the same proneness to substitute natural things for spiritual, in which the Chaldeans began to worship the sun of nature and his natural fire, instead of the Sun of heaven and His divine love. They substituted for the spiritual body, in which man does really rise, the natural body, which goes to dust; and the Jews, in their degeneracy, learned the doctrine from them. It never had a divine origin; it arose as a merely Chaldean superstition, and like other superstitions, is being exploded by the advance of science. The true doctrine, that man rises immediately after death in a spiritual human form—that which was ancient in the time of Plato*—that which was confirmed by our Lord when He said, “God is not God of the dead, but of the living; for all live to Him” (Luke xx. 38)—that which is every way worthy of man, and full of hope and consolation for him—that remains impregnable. Let us cling to that as the star of life assuring us that, when we are “absent from the body, we shall be present with the Lord.” 2 Cor. v. 8.

Three passages occur in the later prophets, in

* Plato, in his Seventh Epistle, says, “It is necessary, indeed, always to believe in the ancient and sacred discourses which announce to us that the soul is immortal, and that it has judges of its conduct, and suffers the greatest punishment when it is liberated from the body.” The Greeks obtained their doctrines from the Egyptians, but none mention the rising again of the body.

which the figure of the rising of a dead body is used to typify the restoration of the Jews to their own land. The people are regarded as dead and buried, in captivity and slavery, and their return is spoken of as a resurrection. Ezekiel does this, and he explains the figure. He wrote during the captivity, and was a captive, as was also Daniel. The prophet says, "The hand of the Lord was upon me, and carried me out in the Spirit of the Lord, and set me down in the midst of the valley which was full of bones. And caused me to pass by them round about; and behold, there were very many in the open valley, and they were very dry." He then records the manner of their resurrection, and finishes with the interpretation as follows: "Then He said unto me, O Son of Man, These bones are the whole house of Israel: behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off for our parts. Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel." Ezek. xxxvii. 1, 2, 11, 12. Here we have a figure of "political resurrection," used by the prophetic spirit, and no doubt in a higher sense descriptive of the rise of the soul from spiritual death to heavenly life; but when we remember that the Israelites were now in a land, and the only land, where the future resurrection of the buried body

was believed in, the use of such a figure is very significant. It shews how all things of earth are used by Divine Wisdom to symbolize the things of heaven.

The prophet Daniel, who, as we have said, also prophesied during the captivity, uses the same symbol of a resurrection to typify in the letter the revival of the Israelitish nation, and the return of the people to their own land, and, in the spirit, the rise of the soul from darkness to light. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame, and everlasting contempt." Dan. xii. 2. To sleep in the dust of the earth, is, like being in the graves of Ezekiel, strongly expressive of the fallen and miserable condition of Israel in Chaldea. The "many of them" that would awake, teaches that a great number would arise to their new nationality, and return to their own country, but not all. Those who would awake to everlasting life were the virtuous, who would rejoice in the divine law and restored temple of their beloved native land; while the vicious, who would again disgrace and ruin themselves by returning to their vile habits again, and bring on themselves deeper ruin, are they who will awake to shame and everlasting contempt.

One other passage there is, in the prophecy of Isaiah, in which the same figure is used; and some very learned commentators, as Gesenius, have ex-

pressed their opinion that the latter portion of that prophecy, including all after the thirteenth chapter, was given during the captivity by a later prophet. But this is not necessary to be admitted. The spirit of the Lord could as readily and easily foretell the return of Israel before they were captive, as afterwards, during the captivity. The passage to which we allude is obscured by italics, which must be rejected to see the real sense. It runs thus :—

יְהוָה כְּתִידָהּ בְּבִלְתִּי יִקְרָאֶנּוּ וְהָיָה טֶהֱמָה עֶשֶׂה
כִּי מִלְּאֹהֵי טֶהֱמָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה חֶסֶד

“Thy dead shall live, my dead body, they shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the land shall cast out the giants.” Isa. xxvi. 19.

The dead are the politically dead, constituting the nation as one dead body. They shall arise, it is said here, as by the two former prophets, to intimate their return to political existence in their own country, under the blessing of heaven, which would come like the descending dew. The giants are those who are monsters in sin. In a spiritual sense, no doubt, it relates to the resurrection of the Church, and of each regenerate individual, employing in prophecy similar language to that used by the apostle Paul, “Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.” Eph. v. 14.

The idea of the resurrection of a dead body is used as the figure of political and spiritual resurrection, but only as a figure. The doctrine that dead bodies would rise and be restored to their souls again, never prevailed among the Jews before their exile in Babylon. There they learned it, and thence they brought it. Never had it any but a heathen origin; and the sooner the sublime doctrine of man's immortality and true resurrection to a more perfect state and a higher life is freed from this absurd addition the better. When it is known that the doctrine had its rise in heathenism, and then was imported among the Jews, and later, when Christianity was inoculated with it, that the first introduction of it into a Creed was by Arius, who contributed so much to corrupt the faith in other respects, all reverence will be taken from it, and what true religion never owned, science will fully explode. As the crude and absurd notion of the gathering of buried dust, again to be formed into bodies, instead of the glorious forms which the angels have, shall expire, the blessed truth that death is the path to higher life will become brighter, and every Christian will indeed be able to say with the apostle, "O grave, where is thy victory! O death, where is thy sting!"

F I N I S.

In order to promote the circulation of Swedenborg's Works, their price has recently been reduced one-third. Printed in clear type and good paper, there are now no cheaper Publications in England.

Any Work in this List will be sent Post or Carriage Free, on receipt of its cost. Postage Stamps may be sent for sums under Five Shillings. Money Orders should be made payable to William White, 36 Bloomsbury Street, at the Post Office, Bloomsbury, London (W.C.).

February, 1858.

SWEDENBORG'S THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

ENGLISH EDITIONS,

Arranged according to the order in which the original works were written and published by the Author.

- 1749-56. *Arcana Cœlestia : the Heavenly Mysteries* contained in the Holy Scripture, or Word of the Lord, unfolded in an exposition of Genesis and Exodus: together with a relation of Wonderful Things seen in the World of Spirits and in the Heaven of Angels. 12 vols., demy 8vo., £2 8s.

Any Volume separate, 4s.

Index to the Arcana Cœlestia. Vol. I., 8s.
Vol. II. is in preparation.

1758. *Heaven and Hell ; also, the Intermediate State, or World of Spirits.* A Relation of Things heard and seen. A New Edition, with copious Index. Demy 8vo., 3s. With HARTLEY'S PREFACE, 3s. 6d.
1758. *The Last Judgment and the Destruction of Babylon ; shewing that all the Predictions in the Revelation are at this day fulfilled : being a Relation of things heard and seen. With a Continuation respecting the Last Judgment and the Spiritual World, and copious Index.* Demy 8vo., 8d.
1758. *On the White Horse, mentioned in the Revelation, chap. xix., with particulars respecting the Word, and its Spiritual Sense. Extracted from the Arcana Cœlestia.* Demy 8vo., 4d.
1758. *On the Earths in our Solar System, and on the Earths in the Starry Heavens : with an Account of their Inhabitants, and also of the Spirits and Angels there ; from what has been heard and seen.* Demy 8vo., 8d.
1758. *On the New Jerusalem and its Heavenly Doctrine, according to what has been heard from Heaven ; to which is prefixed information respecting the New Heaven and the New Earth.* Demy 8vo., 1s.

1763. **Angelic Wisdom concerning the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom.** Demy 8vo., 2s. A New Edition, with copious Index.
1763. **The Four Leading Doctrines of the New Church,** signified by the New Jerusalem in the Revelation; being those respecting the Lord; the Sacred Scripture; Faith; and Life. With an Introductory Preface, and an account of the Author. Demy 8vo., 3s.; foolscap, 2s.
- Each of the above Doctrines may be had separate, namely,*
- The Doctrine of the New Jerusalem respecting the Lord.** To which are added Answers to Questions on the Trinity, proposed by the late Rev. T. Hartley, A.M. Demy 8vo., 1s.
- The Doctrine of the New Jerusalem respecting the Sacred Scripture.** Demy 8vo., 1s.
- The Doctrine of the New Jerusalem respecting Faith.** Demy 8vo., 4d.
- The Doctrine of Life for the New Jerusalem,** from the Commandments of the Decalogue. Demy 8vo., 6d.
1764. **Angelic Wisdom concerning the Divine Providence.** A New Edition, with copious Index. Demy 8vo., 3s.
1766. **The Apocalypse Revealed, in which are disclosed the Arcana therein Foretold.** Two vols., 8s.
1768. **Conjugal Love and its Chaste Delights; also, Adulterous Love and its Insane Pleasures.** A New Edition, with copious Index. Demy 8vo., 4s.
1769. **A Brief Exposition of the Doctrine of the New Church,** signified by the New Jerusalem in the Revelation. 8vo., 10d.
1769. **The Intercourse between the Soul and the Body.** Demy 8vo., 4d.; foolscap, 2d.
1771. **The True Christian Religion; or, the Universal Theology of the New Church;** foretold by the Lord in Daniel vii. 13, 14; and in the Apocalypse xxi. 1, 2. With INDEXES of Words, Names, Subjects, Passages of Scripture; and an INDEX to the Memorable Relations. Demy 8vo., 7s.

POSTHUMOUS WORKS.

- The Coronis or Appendix to the Work entitled The True Christian Religion.** Demy 8vo., 8d.
- The Apocalypse Explained according to the Spiritual Sense.** Six vols., demy 8vo., £1 4s. Any volume separately, 4s.
- A Summary Exposition of the Internal Sense of the Prophetic Books of the Word of the Old Testament and also of the Psalms of David.** Demy 8vo., 1s.
- On the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom.** (Extracted from the Apocalypse Explained.) Demy 8vo., 1s.
- On the Athanasian Creed, and subjects connected with it.** (Extracted from the Apocalypse Explained.) Demy 8vo., sewed, 1s. 6d.; cloth, 2s.
- The Doctrine of Charity.** Demy 8vo., 6d.

FRENCH EDITIONS.

Arcanes Célestes. 16 Vols., 8s. each.

L'Apocalypse Expliquée. Vols. I., II., and III. published, 9s. each.

L'Apocalypse Révélée. Vol. I. just published, 4s. 6d.

Ciel et Enfer. 2s. 6d.

Sagesse Angélique sur le Divin Amour. 4s. 6d.

Sagesse Angélique sur le Divin Providence. 4s. 6d.

La Vraie Religion Chrétienne. 3 Vols., 12s. 6d.

L'Amour Conjugal. 2 Vols., 6s.

Doctrine sur le Seigneur. 2s.

Doctrine sur l'Écriture Sainte. 3s.

Doctrine sur la Foi. 1s. 6d.

Doctrine de Vie. 2s.

Jugement Dernier. 1s. 6d.

Continuation sur le Jugement Dernier. 1s.

Des Terres dans l'Univers. 1s. 6d.

Du Cheval Blanc. 1s.

De la Nouvelle Jérusalem et de sa Doctrine Celeste. 3s. 6d.

Exposition Sommaire de la Doctrine de la Nouvelle Église. 3s.

Commerce de l'Âme et du Corps. 1s.

Appendice à la Vraie Religion Chrétienne. 1s. 6d.

Exposition Sommaire du Sens Interne des Prophètes et des Psaumes. 3s.

De Divin Amour et de la Divin Sagesse, ouvrage posthume. 3s.

De Dieu Triun. 2s.

Des Représentations et des Correspondences. 2s. 6d.

Doctrine de la Charité, ouvrage posthume. 1s.

De la Parole et sa Sainteté. 1s.

Des Biens de la Charité et des Bonnes Œuvres, et Explication du Décalogue. 2s.

Doctrine de la Charité, extraite des Arcanes Célestes. 2s.

De la Toute-Présence et de la Toute-Science de Dieu. 6d.

Neuf Questions sur la Trinité. 3d.

Autobiographie de Swedenborg (Réponse au Hartley). 3d.

Works by M. Le Boys des Guays.

Lettres à un Homme du Monde. Premier série, 2s. 6d.
L'Apocalypse dans son Sens Spirituel. 8s.

LATIN EDITIONS, IN OCTAVO.

Arcana Cœlestia quæ in Scriptura Sacra seu Verbo
Domini sunt, detecta, una cum Mirabilibus quæ visa sunt in mundo
spirituum et in cœlo angelorum. 13 vols., 5s. each.

Sapientia Angelica de Divina Providentia. 3s.

Sapientia Angelica de Divino Amore et de Divina Sapi-
entia. 2s.

Vera Christiana Religio. Vol. I., 16s. Vol. II. in pre-
paration.

Dicta Probantia Veteris et Novi Testamenti collecta et
breviter explicata. Opus posthumum. 2s.

De Domino et de Athanasii Symbolo. 6d.

Doctrina Novæ Hierosolymæ de Charitate. 6d.

Canones, seu Integra Theologia, Novæ Ecclesiæ. De
Deo Uno et Infinito. De Domino Redemptore: et de Redemptione,
De Spiritu Sancto. De Divinâ Trinitate. 6d.

Adversaria in Libros Veteris Testamenti. Continens
Explicationem Geneseos. Vol. I., II., III., IV., V., VI., 5s. each.

Adversaria in Libros Veteris Testamenti. Continens
Leviticum, Numeros, Deuteronomium, Josuam, Judices, Ruth,
Samuelem, Reges, Cronica, Jesajam et Jeremiam. Fasc. 1, 2, 3, 4,
1s. 4d. each; or in 1 vol. cloth boards, 5s. 6d.

Diarium Spirituale. E Chirographo in Bibliothecâ Regiæ
Academiæ Holmiensis asservato.

Para. I. Vol. I., 6s. Vol. II., 9s.

Pars. V. Vols. I. and II., 6s. each.

— II., 5s.

— VI. Continens Indicem Par-

— III. Vols. I. and II., 10s.

tium II.—IV., 4s.

— IV., 2s.

— VII. Vol. I., 5s. Vol. II., 2s.

The two volumes constituting Part V. are a common Index to the Memo-
rabilia of both the Diarium and Adversaria, and one of the most valuable of
Swedenborg's posthumous works.

PUBLISHED BY THE SWEDENBORG SOCIETY,

(INSTITUTED 1810.)

AT ITS HOUSE,

36 BLOOMSBURY STREET, NEW OXFORD STREET,
LONDON (W.C.)



